

exclusion of 6,280,000 aliens in the apportionment of congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10747. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of citizens of Westfield, Mass., favoring the elimination of aliens in making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10748. By Mr. WITHROW: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to change the laws governing officers' retirement pay so that no such pay will be allowed to anyone who receives a salary or other income of \$4,800 or more, and that the money thus saved be used to pay the soldiers' bonus in cash to veterans who are unemployed and in dire need; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10749. By the SPEAKER: Petition of W. Bissell Thomas, accusing Jesse C. Adkins and F. Dickinson Letts, associate justices of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, of malfeasance in office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1933

(Legislative day of Tuesday, February 28, 1933)

The Senate met at 10.30 o'clock a. m., upon the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the approval of the Journal of February 28.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Coolidge	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.
Austin	Copeland	Kean	Russell
Bailey	Costigan	Kendrick	Schall
Bankhead	Dale	Keyes	Schuyler
Barbour	Dickinson	King	Sheppard
Barkley	Dill	La Follette	Shortridge
Bingham	Fess	Lewis	Smith
Black	Fletcher	Logan	Smoot
Blaine	Frazier	McGill	Stelwer
Borah	George	McKellar	Stephens
Bratton	Glass	McNary	Swanson
Brookhart	Glenn	Metcalf	Thomas, Idaho
Broussard	Goldsborough	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Bulley	Gore	Neely	Townsend
Bulow	Grammer	Norris	Trammell
Byrnes	Hale	Nye	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Oddie	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hastings	Patterson	Walcott
Carey	Hatfield	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Clark	Hayden	Reed	Watson
Connally	Hebert	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is unavoidably absent. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] is necessarily detained because of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 44) rescinding the action of the Speaker of the House and the Vice President of the United States in signing the enrolled bill H. R. 14500.

The message also announced that the House had passed, without amendment, bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 5525. An act to extend temporary relief to water users on irrigation projects on Indian reservations, and for other purposes;

S. 5622. An act providing for an alternate budget for the Indian Service, fiscal year 1935;

S. 5675. An act to effect needed changes in the Navy ration; and

S. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to remove existing discriminations incident to certain land grants and to subject them to the same conditions that govern other land grants of their class," approved February 14, 1933.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4039) for the relief of Herman H. Bradford.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 792. An act for the relief of William Joseph Vigneault;

H. R. 1936. An act for the relief of Sydney Thayer, jr.;

H. R. 2599. An act for the relief of Henry Dixon Linebarger;

H. R. 2844. An act for the relief of Elmo K. Gordon;

H. R. 5150. An act for the relief of Annie M. Eopolucci;

H. R. 5548. An act for the relief of George Brackett Cargill, deceased;

H. R. 5989. An act for the relief of John O'Neil;

H. R. 6409. An act for the relief of William Joseph LaCarte;

H. R. 8120. An act for the relief of Jack C. Richardson;

H. R. 9272. An act to correct the rating of John Huntz Roloff, Fleet Naval Reserve;

H. R. 9326. An act for the relief of John E. Davidson;

H. R. 9473. An act for the relief of Olen H. Parker;

H. R. 9877. An act to repeal obsolete sections of the Revised Statutes omitted from the United States Code; and

H. R. 13378. An act to amend sections 416 and 417 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 5122. An act to provide for the purchase and sale of cotton under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture; and

S. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution amending provisions in river and harbor laws relating to local cooperation in the prosecution of waterway improvements.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 533) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States and Alaska; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. EVANS of Montana, Mr. PARSON, and Mr. ARENTZ were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11035) for the relief of Price Huff, asked for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MAY, and Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5070. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant concessions on reservoir sites and other lands in connection with Indian irrigation projects and to lease the lands in such reserves for agricultural, grazing, or other purposes;

H. R. 6490. An act authorizing the erection of a memorial to Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski at Savannah, Ga.;

H. R. 12047. An act to provide for the transfer of powder and other explosive materials from deteriorated and unserviceable ammunition under the control of the War Department to the Department of Agriculture for use in land clearing, drainage, road building, and other agricultural purposes; and

H. R. 13745. An act to provide for agricultural entry of lands withdrawn, classified, or reported as containing any of the minerals subject to disposition under the general leasing law or acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1752. An act to authorize an appropriation for the purchase of land in South Dakota for use as camp sites or rifle ranges for the National Guard of said State;

S. 2654. An act to allow credit in connection with homestead entries to widows of persons who served in certain Indian wars;

S. 4008. An act to amend article 5 of the act of Congress approved June 7, 1897, relating to the approval of regulations for preventing collisions upon certain harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States;

S. 5417. An act to extend the operation of the act entitled "An act for the temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects constructed and operated under the reclamation law," approved April 1, 1932;

H. R. 7716. An act to amend the radio act of 1927, approved February 23, 1927, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 47, ch. 4), and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution for the relief of the State of Idaho.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT (S. DOC. NO. 211)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, without revision, a supplemental estimate of appropriations pertaining to the legislative establishment, fiscal year 1933, amounting to \$15,000, for expenses of inquiries and investigations, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

COMPACT BETWEEN THE STATES OF WYOMING AND IDAHO (S. DOC. NO. 212)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report dated February 24, 1933, from Robert Follansbee, Federal representative, pursuant to the act (46 Stat. 1039) (January 19, 1931) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreement between the States of Wyoming and Idaho with respect to the boundary line between said States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF FOREIGN TRADE OF THE UNITED STATES IN RELATION TO THE TARIFF

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the United States Tariff Commission transmitting in further response to Senate Resolution 325, practically all of the remainder of the manuscript in answer to the requirements of paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 9, and some of the material in response to paragraphs 5 and 7 of the resolution, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Governor of North Carolina, transmitting certified copy of a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, which, with the accompanying resolution, was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Raleigh, February 24, 1933.

The Hon. CHARLES CURTIS,
Vice President, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CURTIS: I have the honor to transmit a certified copy of a joint resolution requesting Congress to refrain from a further invasion of sources of taxation heretofore enjoyed by the States, and that the Congress balance its Budget without further increase in the tax levies.

Respectfully yours,

J. C. B. EHRLINGHAUS,
Governor of North Carolina.

Resolution 18

A joint resolution requesting Congress to refrain from a further invasion of sources of taxation heretofore enjoyed by the States, and that the Congress balance its Budget without further increase in the tax levies

Whereas during the past decade the expenses of all units of local, State, and National Governments have increased to such huge and unprecedented sums as to become burdensome to our people, since no people can contribute more than a reasonable proportion of its income in the aggregate to the support of government, no matter by whom levied nor differing as to whether such taxes be direct or indirect, privilege or excise; and

Whereas all local units of our State government are largely decreasing their tax levies under pressure of the distressing conditions and by way of partial answer to the wailing cries of our people that taxes be reduced and that government become less burdensome; and

Whereas our State government has been compelled to relieve the landowners and farmers of a proportion of the tax levies for the support of public education, as provided for under the constitution, thereby necessitating the tapping of any new sources of revenue that could be found and which appear to have been exhausted, making it necessary to make drastic reductions in the expenses of our State government; and

Whereas in balancing our budget it is becoming necessary to eliminate all bureaus not absolutely vital to the functions of our government; and

Whereas in a further effort to balance our budget drastic and far-reaching reductions are being made in the vital functions of our government to such an extent as to seriously threaten the ability of our State to carry on its program of education, public welfare, construction and maintenance of highways, and other necessary functions reserved to it under the constitution; and

Whereas the Congress during the past year, in an effort to balance its Budget, under its privilege to levy excise taxes found it necessary to levy such taxes as 1 cent per gallon on gasoline, 4 cents per gallon on lubricating oils, 3 per cent consumers' tax on privately produced electricity; and

Whereas the levying of such taxes is reflected in the decreased consumption of such commodities, in that our people are becoming tax conscious, and our sources of revenue are being depleted; which excise-tax levies, if retained, added to, and increased, will ultimately result in the complete absorption of the revenue from sources now enjoyed by the States, resulting in the inability of the States to function: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring). That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested to refrain, in so far as possible, from a further invasion of the sources of revenue now enjoyed by the States.

Sec. 2. That it remove, as soon as it may find it possible to do so, the present excise tax on gasoline, lubricating oils, consumers' tax on electricity, and other similar taxes inserted in its revenue bill of 1932.

Sec. 3. That the Congress balance its Budget in so far as possible by further economies in government and without additional excise-tax levies.

Sec. 4. That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by Governor Ehringhaus to the Congress of the United States and to each of the Members thereof from North Carolina.

Sec. 5. That this resolution be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly, read three times and ratified this 20th day of February, 1933.

A. H. GRAHAM,
President of the Senate.
R. L. HARRIS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Stacey W. Wade, secretary of state of the State of North Carolina, do hereby certify the foregoing and attached three sheets to be a true copy from the records of this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal.

Done in office at Raleigh this 23d day of February, A. D. 1933.
[SEAL.]

STACEY W. WADE,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 (Introduced by Mr. Gilliland)
A concurrent resolution relating to Senate bill 1197, known as the Frazier bill, and the enactment of the domestic allotment plan

Whereas it is an indisputable fact that this Nation can not, as a whole, secure or enjoy prosperity until the large number of its citizens who are dependent upon agriculture for a living are given assistance in securing a fair return for their labor and investment, and until this can be accomplished, also are given assistance in carrying the heavy burden of existing agricultural debts; and

Whereas it is the opinion and belief of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota that these objects can best be accomplished by the prompt passing of Senate bill No. 1197, known as the Frazier bill, to liquidate and refinance agricultural indebtedness, and by the enactment of the domestic allotment plan for reducing surplus production and securing a fair price for agricultural products: Be it therefore

Resolved by the senate (the house of representative concurring), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to speedily enact the Frazier bill and the domestic allotment plan in order to avoid a collapse of our basic industry and all industries dependent upon it; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully petitioned to expedite such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to supply copies of this resolution to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the governor of each of the United States with the request that it be transmitted to the legislature of each State.

H. ALLSTRUP,
President of the Senate.
JOE ATKINS,
Secretary of the Senate.
GEORGE ABILD,
Speaker of the House.
H. BODERY,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

STATE OF UTAH,
SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, M. H. Welling, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the following is a full, true, and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Memorial No. 2, memorializing Congress to pass House bill 11816 for the regulation and control of the public range of the United States and for the creation of grazing districts by the Secretary of the Interior under the direct supervision of the users of the public range, as passed by the twentieth legislature and approved by the governor February 23, 1933, as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah, at Salt Lake City, this 25th day of February, 1933.

[SEAL.]

M. H. WELLING,
Secretary of State.

Memorializing Congress to pass House bill 11816 for the regulation and control of the public range of the United States and for the creation of grazing districts by the Secretary of the Interior under the direct supervision of the users of the public range
Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the governor concurring therein), That—

Whereas there is urgent necessity for the enactment of proper legislation by the Congress of the United States for some regulatory control over the public range lands in the Western States, for the purpose of protecting the overuse of said grazing lands, and to stabilize the livestock interests thereon; and

Whereas the Colton grazing bill, introduced in the House of Representatives by the Hon. DON B. COLTON as H. R. 11816, has been generally approved by the Western States, in which is situated the great bodies of grazing lands in the United States; and

Whereas the said Colton bill has been closely studied and analyzed by the livestock interests of Utah, and several local reserves have been organized by livestock interests of Utah, for the purpose of operating under the said Colton bill, and such interests are urging the immediate passage of the said Colton bill, and it is generally believed to be to the best interest of the people of Utah that the said Colton bill be enacted into the law: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we respectfully urge the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States to pass, and the President to approve, H. R. 11816 (by Don B. Colton) for the control and regulation of the public range during the present session of the Congress, to the end that its provisions may become effective at the earliest possible date; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State forward certified copies of this memorial to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate of the United States, and to the President of the United States, and to Utah's congressional delegation.

The foregoing Senate Concurrent Memorial No. 2 was publicly read by title and immediately thereafter signed by the president

of the senate, in the presence of the house over which he presides, and the fact of such signing duly entered upon the journal this 16th day of February, 1933.

J. FRANCIS FOWLES,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

LYMAN S. RICHARDS,
Secretary of the Senate.

The foregoing Senate Concurrent Memorial No. 2 was publicly read by title and immediately thereafter signed by the speaker of the house, in the presence of the house over which he presides, and the fact of such signing duly entered upon the journal this 16th day of February, 1933.

I. A. SMOOT,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

ERNEST R. MCKAY,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Received from the senate this 17th day of February, 1933.
Approved February 23, 1933.

HENRY H. BLOOD, Governor.

Received from the governor, and filed in the office of the secretary of state this 23d day of February, 1933.

M. H. WELLING,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a telegram from Carson City, Nev., signed by W. G. Greathouse, embodying a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Nevada, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARSON CITY, NEV., February 28, 1933.

HON. CHARLES CURTIS,
Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution approved by Nevada Legislature to-day: "Senate joint resolution memorializing Congress to not close the United States mint at Carson City, Nev."

"To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"The Legislature of the State of Nevada hereby respectfully represents that—

"Whereas the closing of the United States mint at Carson City, Nev., would be a calamity both to the mining industry and every business interest of this State, it being an imperative necessity to mine operators and prospectors with small quantities of bullion which they must sell to keep their activities going, and any arrangement by which such bullion would have to be shipped to assay offices at a distance would not be feasible; and

"Whereas the business of said mint in the past year has doubled and for no reason is its closing justified: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of Nevada, That we earnestly entreat Congress to reconsider its action and to continue the appropriation for the United States mint at Carson City, Nev."

W. G. GREATHOUSE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the passage of legislation known as the Frazier farm relief bill, and the passage of legislation to create a farm debt commission to refinance farm loans so as to correspond with losses during the past 12 years, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented to-day by Mr. FRAZIER.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Central Trades and Labor Council of New Orleans, La., opposing a continuance of the investigation by a Senate committee of the Louisiana senatorial election of 1932 and the spending of additional money therefor, which were referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a memorial from Dr. Victor B. Stassi, of New Orleans, La., remonstrating against a continuance of the investigation by a Senate committee of the Louisiana senatorial election of 1932 and the spending of additional money therefor, which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions of the Common Council of the City of Blue Island, Ill.; the Common Council of the City of Revere, Mass.; the Common Council of the City of Schenectady, N. Y.; and the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of legislation authorizing the issuance of a special series of postage stamps

of the denomination of 3 cents, commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the naturalization as an American citizen and appointment as brevet brigadier general of the Continental Army on October 13, 1783, of Thaddeus Kosciusko, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from the National Association of Merchant Tailors of America, New York City, N. Y., praying for the prompt passage of the so-called Dies bill, being the bill (H. R. 12044) to provide for the exclusion and expulsion of alien communists, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a memorial of sundry citizens of Des Moines, Iowa (assembled in mass meeting under the auspices of the International Labor Defense), remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Dies bill, being the bill (H. R. 12044) to provide for the exclusion and expulsion of alien communists, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions adopted by the Woman's Missionary Society of St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Washington, D. C., the Methodist Episcopal Church of Palco, and local chapters of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Almena, Clayton, Eureka, and Kingsdown, all in the State of Kansas, favoring the passage of legislation to regulate and supervise the motion-picture industry, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. RUSSELL presented a resolution adopted by Cobb County Post, No. 2681, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Marietta, Ga., favoring a moderate and reasonable inflation of the currency and the payment of adjusted-compensation certificates of World War veterans as a means of quickly and generally distributing such inflated currency, thereby alleviating the present economic distress of the people, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Cobb County Post, No. 2681, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Marietta, Ga., indorsing the "Buy American" movement, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by the American Legion Auxiliary, Yonkers Post, No. 7, of Yonkers, N. Y., opposing proposed reductions in veterans' appropriations and protesting against the methods and proposals of the National Economy League and the United States Chamber of Commerce with respect thereto, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of G. E. Manning and sundry other citizens of Oakfield, N. Y., remonstrating against the adoption of the so-called Couzens amendment to the Army appropriation bill, providing for the establishment of camps for the youth of the Nation and making appropriation therefor, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorial of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Sodus Point and sundry other citizens, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the passage of legislation legalizing the manufacture and sale of beer and liquors with an alcoholic content stronger than one-half of 1 per cent, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRAZIER. I present resolutions adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota setting forth their opinions upon the farm situation and asking certain relief, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution A-6 (introduced by Senator Martin)

Be it resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota:

Whereas ever since the order of the Federal Reserve Board, in May, 1920, calling for a contraction of the currency the farmers have witnessed the loss of their land through foreclosure until many counties in this State have had 80 per cent of all farms foreclosed; and

Whereas during the past two years this process of paying everything and receiving nothing for their crops has brought about a

condition where to finish paying debts is mathematically impossible and the loss of their property and homes is now merely a matter of days; and

Whereas every attempt on the part of the Government to supply Federal loans has been intrusted to the directors and attachés of the Twin City banks, with jurisdiction over this territory; and

Whereas these directors have manipulated the extension of these Government loans for the purpose of collecting their own loans, and through the process no new money has been available to the farmers; and

Whereas through mortgages, insurance policies, and other charges the farmer has been so securely bound that he is now unable to extricate himself; and

Whereas all of these conditions thus accumulated and occurring together have caused the farmers to lose faith in the Government and the officials who have administered it during the past 12 years, and are now in almost open rebellion; and

Whereas the farmers have no further hope than to save their homes and families from utter ruin, and have openly banded together to protect these homes by the use of force, acting collectively; and

Whereas any attempt to prevent them from congregating and using any means, peaceful or otherwise, to protect their families will inevitably culminate in disorders and insurrections: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we petition Congress to be advised of the situation that it may act speedily and wisely to remove the pressure under which the farmers are struggling and thus preserve peace and order in a great country. To this end we ask Congress to pass the following legislation:

1. The Frazier bill and a farm debt commission that will re-finance the farms and scale down farm debts to correspond with farm losses during the past 12 years.

2. That the distribution of Government finance agencies be taken away from the manipulation of bankers and placed in the hands of directors whose only ambition shall be to actually aid agriculture.

3. That the Patman bill be passed, paying the soldiers by the issuance of Treasury notes.

4. That the Wheeler bill be passed remonetizing silver, which will remove from the hoarded money of the country the unwarranted and stupendous premium which it now commands.

5. The apportionment plan in which we insist upon the cost of production; be it further

Resolved, That Congress take full notice of this warning and at least partially understand that we have reached a crisis in the handling of our farm problem, and it now becomes the duty of public officials to rise above party and command enough patriotism to rescue this country from the grip of the international bankers, who, because of an insatiate desire to accumulate more wealth, are fast driving the greatest Government on earth upon the rocks of destruction; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Members in Congress and to the Speaker of the House and to the Vice President.

Mr. SMOOT presented the following concurrent memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, which was ordered to lie on the table:

STATE OF UTAH,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, M. H. Welling, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the following is a full, true, and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Memorial No. 7, a memorial to the Congress of the United States protesting against the Bratton amendment to the Treasury and Post Office bill eliminating the Salt Lake veterans' hospital and regional offices at Salt Lake City as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah at Salt Lake City, this 21st day of February, 1933.

[SEAL.]

M. H. WELLING,
Secretary of State.

A memorial to the Congress of the United States protesting against the Bratton amendment to the Treasury and Post Office bill eliminating the Salt Lake veterans' hospital and regional offices at Salt Lake City

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the governor concurring therein):

Whereas there is an urgent need for retention of the veterans' hospital and regional offices at Salt Lake City maintained to serve a large section of the intermountain region not otherwise served; and

Whereas it is proposed by an amendment to the Treasury and Post Office bill, in conference between the Houses of Congress of the United States, such amendment being known as the Bratton amendment, to abolish such regional offices and to close such hospital: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah in regular session assembled, That the Congress of the United States be urgently requested to refrain from any act closing such regional offices and veterans' hospital at Salt Lake City; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state forward copies of this memorial to Utah's delegation in Congress.

J. FRANCIS FOWLES,
President of the Senate.

The foregoing Senate Concurrent Memorial No. 7 was publicly read by title and immediately thereafter signed by the speaker of the house, in the presence of the house over which he presides, sides, and the fact of such signing duly entered upon the journal this 18th day of February, 1933.

Attest:

LYMAN S. RICHARDS,
Secretary of the Senate.
I. A. SMOOT,
Speaker of the House.

The foregoing Senate Concurrent Memorial No. 7 was publicly read by title and immediately thereafter signed by the president of the senate, in the presence of the house over which he presides, and the fact of such signing duly entered upon the journal this 20th day of February, 1933.

Attest:

ERNEST R. MCKAY,
Chief Clerk of House.

Received from the senate this 20th day of February, 1933. Approved February 20, 1933.

HENRY H. BLOOD, *Governor.*

Received from the governor and filed in the office of the secretary of state this 21st day of February, 1933.

M. H. WELLING,
Secretary of State.

Mr. BRATTON presented the following joint memorials of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, which were ordered to lie on the table:

House Joint Memorial 2 (Introduced by Jack M. Potter)

A memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to include in the plan for an adequate flood control of the Mississippi River area the construction of flood-control reservoirs on the Dry Cimarron River within the State of New Mexico

Whereas the Congress of the United States, on May 15, 1928, passed a flood control act for the purpose of controlling the devastating floods in the lower Mississippi River; and

Whereas stream control, not only in the lower Mississippi Valley, but throughout the entire water bed of the entire Mississippi River, is necessarily a part of an adequate plan, to solve this situation; and

Whereas control by reservoirs of tributary streams for the purpose of withholding and controlling flood and waste waters, as well as for irrigation and other beneficial uses, is a necessary part of an adequate plan for the control of the Mississippi Valley; and

Whereas the Dry Cimarron River in Colfax and Union Counties, N. Mex., a tributary of the Mississippi, annually contributes large and disastrous amounts of flood waters to the Mississippi under flood conditions; and

Whereas the hydrographic survey of the Dry Cimarron River in New Mexico, made by the State of New Mexico, shows three dam sites for flood-control reservoirs, which are sufficient and adequate for control of all waters arising in New Mexico:

Now, therefore, the Eleventh Legislature of the State of New Mexico does hereby request the Congress of the United States, and all bureaus and departments of the Federal Government, to include in the plans for Mississippi Valley flood control the construction of the said three flood-control reservoirs on the Dry Cimarron River in the State of New Mexico; and be it

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to the Hon. SAM BRATTON, and Hon. BRANSON CUTTING, Senators of New Mexico, and to the Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, Representative in Congress from the State of New Mexico.

ALVAN N. WHITE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

GEO. W. ARMILJO,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
TAYLOR E. JULIEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

Attest:

F. E. McCULLOCH,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Approved by me this 23d day of February, 1933.

ARTHUR SELIGMAN,
Governor of New Mexico.

House Joint Memorial 4 (Introduced by Willis Ford)

A memorial to Congress to allow home owners to borrow directly from the Government upon a plan similar to the Federal land loan act

Whereas under present conditions all industries and all property owners are being encouraged, except the home owner, for whom little or no relief is being provided; and

Whereas because of such conditions, people, rather than attempt to have and own their homes, are turning away from the individual homes and living in apartments, hotels, tenements, and other rented property; and

Whereas it is essential to the public welfare and vital to our American civilization that the building and owning of individual homes be encouraged among our people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of New Mexico does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation as will allow the individual to borrow directly from the Government of the United States, through such agencies as

may be established, for the purpose of building, buying, or improving the home, under a plan similar to that allowed farmers under the provisions of the Federal farm loan act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the presiding officers of both Houses of the United States Congress.

ALVAN N. WHITE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

GEO. W. ARMILJO,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
TAYLOR E. JULIEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

Attest:

F. E. McCULLOCH,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Approved by me this 21st day of February, 1933.

ARTHUR SELIGMAN,
Governor of New Mexico.

BOULDER CANYON LAKE AND PARK

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, in opposition to S. 5637, introduced for the establishment, development, and administration of the Boulder Canyon National Reservation and the development and administration of the Boulder Canyon Project Federal Reservation and for other purposes, I made a brief statement before a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the Senate on February 24, 1933, which I submit for the RECORD, as follows:

The very title of this act indicates its extreme complexity. It assembles a number of problems, the solutions of which should be made entirely separate and the subjects of separate bills. It will be six or seven years before the lake is created and the officials of the State of Nevada and its representatives in Congress should be given full opportunity to investigate the question of forming a national park surrounding the lake. There is no apparent need for hurry in this matter and the people of Nevada should be fully informed of every detail concerning it before legislation is finally enacted.

On February 15, 1933, the Federal District Court, District of Nevada, dismissed the complaints in the pending tax suits by the Six Companies (Inc.) so that that company is now liable for the payment of taxes on the property at the Hoover Dam. Having failed to win in the courts, the Secretary of the Interior has conceived and is now pressing this legislation for action to create a national park, and to establish an exclusive jurisdiction reservation, all for the purpose of circumventing and evading the sovereignty and the laws of the State of Nevada. Having lost in the pending tax cases, the Secretary of the Interior now seeks in behalf of the Six Companies (Inc.) to accomplish by way of legislation what he failed to accomplish through the courts. There is no way that this act can be amended to the satisfaction of the State of Nevada. The whole basis upon which the legislation is built is too complex and involved, and I therefore strongly oppose reporting this bill in this Congress.

On the question of the attempt made by the Secretary of the Interior to create a reservation of exclusive Federal jurisdiction and his activities in behalf of the Six Companies (Inc.) in prosecuting their suits against the officials of the State of Nevada, I made an extended statement in the Senate on February 15, 1933, pages 4126 to 4138 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. This was before the news was received of the dismissing of the complaints in the pending tax suits by the Federal district court.

The Secretary of the Interior wrote me on February 25, 1933, concerning this statement, and I submit his letter for the RECORD, together with my reply:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 25, 1933.

HON. TASKER L. ODDIE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR ODDIE: My attention has been called to a statement made by you yesterday before one of the committees of the Senate regarding the proposed reservation in connection with the Hoover Dam area.

Evidently you have not understood just what we have been trying to do at Boulder City and in the surrounding area. The Federal Government must accept full responsibility for this construction town. We have endeavored to make it clean, decent, and a wholesome place for American families of small means. We have maintained the reservation with care, not only to safeguard the welfare of the worker on the job but it has also been necessary for us, because of the Nevada laws and customs, to fight off the bootlegger, the prostitute, and the gambler. Judging by what is going on in other parts of Nevada, without our special efforts not only would the bootlegger and the prostitute and the gambler be admitted to our construction city, but the costs of the project would be increased and the authorities of the Federal Government would have to accept responsibility for conditions that, to say the least, would be undesirable and unwholesome.

All other questions are of secondary consideration in a matter of this kind, having to do with human welfare and with the dignity of the Federal Government.

Very sincerely yours,

RAY LYMAN WILBUR.

FEBRUARY 28, 1933.

HON. RAY LYMAN WILBUR,

Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your letter of February 25, 1933, expressing such great solicitude for the workers at Hoover Dam is indeed difficult to reconcile in the light of the many things you have done to assist the Six Companies (Inc.), the private contractor, the builder of the dam, in its attempt to evade the tax and mine safety laws of Nevada and thus unjustly fatten itself at the expense of the people of the State and the lives and welfare of the workers at Boulder City.

In attempting to create the so-called Boulder Canyon project Federal reservation of exclusive Federal jurisdiction on inadequate constitutional and statutory premises you provided the Six Companies (Inc.), the contractor, with the pretext which that company cited in its suits to evade the payment of taxes to Clark County and the State of Nevada and the mine safety laws. Furthermore, at the expense of the taxpayer you supplied Federal legal assistance to the private company in directing the counsel of the Reclamation Service to file an amicus curiæ brief in its behalf. Through your request the Attorney General also filed an amicus curiæ brief in support of the Six Companies (Inc.), additional and most effective Federal counsel at no cost to the company.

Your position and that of the Six Companies (Inc.), which you sustained in this matter, was recently completely overruled by the Federal district court in dismissing the tax suits. In the bill which you are now proposing it is apparent that you are attempting to accomplish by legislation that which the Federal court has recently refused to grant.

The Government in these cases would not have received any of the savings in tax payments and by the use of dangerous but cheaper methods of construction. The Six Companies (Inc.), however, would have benefited at the expense of the State and at the greater risk of loss of life and injury to the workers at the dam. When you say in defense of your action in attempting to create an exclusive Federal-jurisdiction reservation, "not only to safeguard the welfare of the worker on the job" and your official acts have been so detrimental to the best interests of the workers, it leaves only one conclusion, that your letter of professed solicitude for the welfare of the worker is only a smoke screen to hide your efforts in behalf of the Six Companies (Inc.).

All of these disclosures emphasize the great necessity for an immediate and thorough investigation of your department, the Six Companies (Inc.), and the relationship existing between this Government enterprise and those having dealings with it.

It ill becomes a Federal official in your position to make a misleading and unjust attack on a sovereign State. I resent your misrepresentations regarding conditions in Nevada, as well as your prejudiced defense of the conditions existing at Hoover Dam which have resulted in much unnecessary loss of life, human suffering, and misery for which your department and the Six Companies (Inc.) are responsible.

Very sincerely yours,

TASKER L. ODDIE.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE, KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H. R. 14500) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Kansas City, Kans., was passed. I move that the House of Representatives be requested to return the papers to the Senate for the purpose of having the bill corrected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made.

REPORT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 210)

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Public Buildings Commission, I submit the annual report of that commission, as is done every year, and I ask that it may be printed, with the illustrations, as a public document and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. COPELAND, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 4928) to provide fees to be charged by the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1324) thereon.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6402) to further regulate banking, banks, trust companies, and building and loan associations in the District of Columbia, and

for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1326) thereon.

Mr. SCHUYLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3789) for the relief of Benjamin Wright, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1327) thereon.

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 434) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to provide additional facilities for the classification of cotton under the United States cotton standards act, reported it without amendment.

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 5664) to amend an act approved March 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 1548), entitled "An act to supplement the last three paragraphs of section 5 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1161), as amended by the act of March 21, 1918 (40 Stat. 458), reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1329) thereon.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 2935. An act for the relief of J. R. Reimer (Rept. No. 1330); and

H. R. 7278. An act for the relief of Joseph Vigliotti (Rept. No. 1331).

Mr. STEIWER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5214) for the relief of Withycombe Post, No. 11, American Legion, Corvallis, Oreg., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1332) thereon.

Mr. COOLIDGE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 657) for the relief of Peter Bess, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1333) thereon.

Mr. BROOKHART, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 3694. An act for the relief of Ada B. (Gould) Gollan (Rept. No. 1334); and

H. R. 10170. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of Joseph T. Ryerson & Son (Inc.) (Rept. No. 1335).

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 5444. An act to provide an additional appropriation as the result of a reinvestigation, pursuant to the act of February 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 2047, pt. 2), for the payment of claims of persons who suffered property damage, death, or personal injury due to the explosions at the naval ammunition depot, Lake Denmark, N. J., July 10, 1926 (Rept. No. 1336);

H. R. 6774. An act to authorize amendment of the act of February 25, 1927, for the payment of damages caused by reason of the overflow of the Rio Grande on August 17, 1921 (Rept. No. 1337);

H. R. 6381. An act for the relief of Escha Whittington Casey (Rept. No. 1338); and

H. R. 3848. An act for the relief of Ed Symes and wife, Elizabeth Symes, and certain other citizens of the State of Texas (Rept. No. 1339).

Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 973. An act for the relief of John L. Dunn (Rept. No. 1340);

H. R. 1203. An act for the relief of Edward J. O'Neil (Rept. No. 1342);

H. R. 1206. An act for the relief of George Beier (Rept. No. 1343);

H. R. 2217. An act for the relief of the Bethel Cemetery Co., the Presbyterian Church, Harold S. Stubbs, George Morgan, Edward Stapp, William J. Howard, David J. Seacord, Mary L. McIntire, Emma E. Foard, Herbert C. Hanigan, Sisters of St. Basil, Edward Bedwell, and Rachel A. Loveless (Rept. No. 1344); and

H. R. 7038. An act for the relief of Frances Southard (Rept. No. 1345).

Mr. WHITE also, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7040) for the relief of Sadie Bermi, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1341) thereon.

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4773) for the relief of Capt. Guy M. Kinman, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1346) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 2294. An act for the relief of C. A. Cates (Rept. No. 1347);

H. R. 3626. An act for the relief of John I. Lowe (Rept. No. 1348);

H. R. 5947. An act for the relief of John Moore (Rept. No. 1349);

H. R. 6275. An act for the relief of Howard McKee (Rept. No. 1350);

H. R. 7128. An act for the relief of Della O'Brien (Rept. No. 1351);

H. R. 8215. An act for the relief of the National Bank of Commerce, El Dorado, Ark. (Rept. No. 1352); and

H. R. 8217. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of El Dorado, Ark. (Rept. No. 1353).

Mr. NYE, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13745) to provide for agricultural entry of lands withdrawn, classified, or reported as containing any of the minerals subject to disposition under the general leasing law or acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1355) thereon.

WATER RESOURCES OF THE SACRAMENTO, SAN JOAQUIN, AND KERN RIVERS, CALIF.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, submitted a report, pursuant to the resolution (S. Res. 177) authorizing an investigation of the subject of the utilization of the water resources of the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern Rivers, in California (submitted by Mr. JOHNSON and agreed to June 27, 1932), which was ordered to be printed as Report No. 1325.

INVESTIGATION OF RENTAL CONDITIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, submitted a report pursuant to the resolution (S. Res. 248) to investigate rental conditions in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to be printed as Report No. 1354.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 5697) making it a crime to represent oneself to be an Indian, and providing punishment therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 5698) granting certain public lands to the State of Montana for the use and benefit of the Northern Montana College, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 5699) to amend the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 5700) to extend the mining laws of the United States to the Death Valley National Monument in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 260) to validate an act of the fourth special session of the twelfth legislature of

Puerto Rico entitled "An act authorizing the Governor of Puerto Rico to guarantee repayment, in the name of the people of Puerto Rico, of loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the agricultural credit corporations of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes," approved October 21, 1932; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 5070. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant concessions on reservoir sites and other lands in connection with Indian irrigation projects and to lease the lands in such reserves for agricultural, grazing, or other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 6490. An act authorizing the erection of a memorial to Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski at Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 13745. An act to provide for agricultural entry of lands withdrawn, classified, or reported as containing any of the minerals subject to disposition under the general leasing law or acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14724) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. AYRES, Mr. OLIVER of Alabama, Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona, Mr. FRENCH, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14359) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 14059) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, in behalf of Indians, to purchase the allotments of deceased Indians, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 5233. An act to provide for the protection of national military parks, national parks, battlefield sites, national monuments, and miscellaneous memorials under the control of the War Department;

S. 5469. An act to provide for the creation of the Morristown National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes;

S. 5525. An act to extend temporary relief to water users on irrigation projects on Indian reservations, and for other purposes;

S. 5622. An act providing for an alternate budget for the Indian Service, fiscal year 1935;

S. 5675. An act to effect needed changes in the Navy ration;

H. R. 792. An act for the relief of William Joseph Vigneault;

H. R. 1936. An act for the relief of Sydney Thayer, jr.;

H. R. 2599. An act for the relief of Henry Dixon Linebarger;

H. R. 2844. An act for the relief of Elmo K. Gordon;

H. R. 4039. An act for the relief of Herman H. Bradford;

H. R. 5150. An act for the relief of Annie M. Eopolucci;

H. R. 5548. An act for the relief of George Brackett Cargill, deceased;

H. R. 5989. An act for the relief of John O'Neill;

H. R. 8120. An act for the relief of Jack C. Richardson;

H. R. 9272. An act to correct the rating of John Huntz Roloff, Fleet Naval Reserve;

H. R. 9326. An act for the relief of John E. Davidson;

H. R. 9473. An act for the relief of Olen H. Parker;

H. R. 9877. An act to repeal obsolete sections of the Revised Statutes omitted from the United States Code;

H. R. 13378. An act to amend sections 416 and 417 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia;

H. R. 13372. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to remove existing discriminations incident to certain land grants and to subject them to the same conditions that govern other land grants of their class," approved February 14, 1933.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 14059) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, in behalf of Indians, to purchase the allotments of deceased Indians, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14724) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. SHORTRIDGE, Mr. HALE, Mr. KEYES, Mr. GLASS, and Mr. BROUSSARD conferees on the part of the Senate.

LOCAL COOPERATION IN PROSECUTION OF WATERWAY IMPROVEMENTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 235) amending provisions in river and harbor laws relating to local cooperation in the prosecution of waterway improvements, which was, on page 1, lines 6 and 7, to strike out "subject to the approval of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors" and insert "upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers."

Mr. BULKLEY. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On February 28, 1933:

S. 2148. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Killion; and

S. 5339. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey certain properties to the county of Arlington, State of Virginia, in order to connect Lee Boulevard with the Arlington Memorial Bridge, and for other purposes.

On March 1, 1933:

S. 88. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to investigate the conditions of the lease of the post-office garage in Boston, Mass., and to readjust the terms thereof;

S. 466. An act for the relief of the Allegheny Forging Co.;

S. 4327. An act for the relief of Lizzie Pittman; and

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the bequest of the late William F. Edgar, of Los Angeles County, State of California, for the benefit of the museum and library connected with the office of the Surgeon General of the United States Army.

PROPOSED OCEAN MAIL CONTRACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 375) submitted by Mr. BLACK February 27, request-

ing the Postmaster General to postpone the awarding of a contract for ocean mail service from Philadelphia-Baltimore to Liverpool-Manchester, which is as follows:

Whereas specifications have been issued by the Postmaster General calling for bids on March 1 for an ocean mail contract from Philadelphia-Baltimore to Liverpool-Manchester, route No. 58-B, which involves the establishment of a new steamship service and the payment by the Government of about \$1,000,000 per annum for 10 years, or \$10,000,000 in mail money, and also involves the selling of vessels by the United States Lines Co. for a reported price of \$500,000 each, which were recently purchased from the Shipping Board for \$131,250 each; and

Whereas this proposed new steamship service competes with other American services already established at a great cost to the Government, which services also receive mail pay; and

Whereas it is understood this new line is to be operated by the International Mercantile Marine Co. (Inc.), which already receives large subsidies from the Government, while at the same time operating foreign-flag lines competing with American lines; and

Whereas it appears that there has not been and will not be sufficient time to fully investigate the economic necessity of such line or the propriety of granting a mail contract on March 1 next, and as the matter of ocean mail contracts is to be generally investigated by a committee of the Senate; and

Whereas the Merchant Fleet Corporation reported on February 6, 1933, that this steamship service is not justified: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be requested to postpone the awarding of the said mail contract until the matter can be more fully investigated and the soundness of the proposition more completely determined from the standpoint of the Government's interest and all the facts and circumstances involved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, during the debate upon this resolution yesterday many charges of fraud and corruption were made. It was charged that the contract in question would be invalid if made, and many strong adjectives were used. I suppose it is always so that at the end of a feverish session of this sort strong language is used which is not always justified by the facts of the case.

I do not intend to take much time, but I want briefly to try to show how utterly unwarranted were the charges of fraud or corruption that were made here yesterday. Of course, if they were justified, the contract would be no good whatsoever. The Attorney General now in office, or he who is about to come into office, would immediately move to set the contract aside. The Court of Claims would not enforce it. There would be no effect whatsoever in concluding the contract. But I want to show how utterly unwarranted were the charges.

We heard it said yesterday that the concern which is seeking the postal subvention is owned by J. P. Morgan & Co. and the Chase National Bank, who, by reason of their occupations, must be tainted with the faults which have recently been shown up regarding other but different bankers, as if it proved every bricklayer to be a felon to show that some one bricklayer had been convicted of a felony. Then it was argued that the fact that haste was being shown in the conclusion of the contract was conclusive evidence that it was fraudulent and corrupt.

It was stated that this \$10,000,000 which was to be taken out of the United States Government in the course of 10 years was being stolen from the Government, and finally it was implied, if not stated, that any of us who would vote against the resolution would partake of the taint and the corruption which underlie the whole transaction.

Mr. President, I should like to consider a few of the facts. About 30 years ago the firm of J. P. Morgan, headed by the elder Morgan, did superintend the organization of the International Mercantile Marine, and, as I recall my financial history, that was the one conspicuous, outstanding failure among the great accomplishments of J. P. Morgan the elder. It never did succeed. It was always limping along. It had a burst of prosperity, as did every other shipowner, during the closing years of the war, but all the rest of the time it was just barely managing to stay alive.

About three years ago there was formed in New York a firm called the Roosevelt Steamship Co. (Inc.), and the organizers of that were a group of young men who had nothing whatever to do with J. P. Morgan & Co., or the International Mercantile Marine, except that the father of

one of them, Mr. P. A. S. Franklin, was a high official of the International Mercantile Marine; but the organizers were these young men, Kermit Roosevelt and a group of his friends, including Vincent Astor, who supplied a good part of the capital.

After they had organized that Roosevelt Steamship Co. (Inc.) they conceived the idea of buying control of the International Mercantile Marine, not by private transaction but by buying the stock in the open market, and these young men, straining their credit to the utmost, except possibly Astor—I do not know whether he strained his or not, but I am told the others did—bought enough International Mercantile Marine stock in the open market some three years ago to secure control of that corporation.

When they got it, they found in its list of directors the names of J. P. Morgan and Charles Steele, Mr. Morgan's partner. But when they came to look up the stock list, they found that Mr. Morgan owned only one share of stock and that Mr. Charles Steele owned only one share; and if any Senator cares to verify that, he will find the complete stock list of this corporation printed in the Senate hearings on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill of last year, and that shows J. P. Morgan the owner of one share, and J. P. Morgan & Co. the owners of no shares.

Discovering that these young men had bought control of this company by this process, Mr. Morgan and Mr. Steele more than two years ago sent in their resignations from the board and the resignations of both of them were immediately accepted. That is the present connection of J. P. Morgan with the International Mercantile Marine. I do not know whether he ever sold his one share of stock or whether he still has it, but out of this great number of shares, 615,000 of them being outstanding, J. P. Morgan owns one share, unless he has sold it within the last two years, and I do not know whether he has or not. He has not been a director for two years, nor has Mr. Steele. So that if it be true that the presence of J. P. Morgan on the board of the corporation makes all these contracts fraudulent—and it seems to me the reasoning from cause to effect in that premise is a little violent—if that be true, still this contract is not so tainted, because he has not been on the board for two years.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I do not desire to take the Senator's time, but I understood him to say that Morgan had not been on the board for three years.

Mr. REED. For over two years, I am told.

Mr. BLACK. Then a letter I find in the record, which the Senator has, evidently gave wrong information. It is on page 424 of the record.

Mr. REED. I have it open before me.

Mr. BLACK. It is dated March 7, 1932.

Mr. REED. That is correct. That is a letter from the chairman of the Shipping Board inclosing to the chairman of the House committee the latest list of directors and the latest stock list that he has for this corporation. Evidently he was sending on a list that was not up to date.

Mr. BLACK. That shows that Mr. Morgan was a director. I did not understand the Senator to say, did I—and I do not want to delay him at all—

Mr. REED. I am glad to answer the Senator's questions.

Mr. BLACK. That these young gentlemen he mentions had the controlling stock in the International Mercantile Marine?

Mr. REED. Quite so; they did.

Mr. BLACK. This record shows that each one of them has 12,500 shares out of a total of 615,000.

Mr. REED. They have told me that they bought control more than two years ago in the open market. In what names the stock may be, I do not know. I saw some brokers' accounts in large numbers of shares, and it may be that some of their stock is carried in that way.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is familiar with this record, however, which does show, if it is correct, that they do not own a majority, but only a small portion of the stock.

Mr. REED. I am familiar with the record, which shows that not more than some forty or fifty thousand shares are in their names; yes.

Mr. BLACK. Out of some 615,000 shares.

Mr. REED. Yes; but they or anybody else may own stock that is in a broker's name, and I am relying entirely upon their statement to me last night that they bought control of the company in the open market some three years ago; and that Mr. Morgan and Mr. Steele resigned from the board more than two years ago.

Some stress was placed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] yesterday upon the fact that the International Mercantile Marine owned some eight ships, or thereabouts, which flew the British flag, and which were subject to commandeering by the British Government in the case of the war needs of that Empire. That was completely and effectually answered by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Copeland] when he showed that away back in the boom days of 1920, when shipping was at a premium, the International Mercantile Marine wanted to sell those ships and get rid of them so as to have nothing but ships flying the American flag, and at the personal request of President Wilson the ships were not then sold, but were retained by the company.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. May I add this statement to what I said yesterday? Not alone did President Wilson act to interfere with the sale of the ships to a British company, but a move was made for our Shipping Board to buy those ships and have them transferred to the American flag, and actually a contract was drawn up. Then, because economy was thought of, it was decided not to do that. In other words, the ships were left in the hands of the International Mercantile Marine much against the desire of that outfit and in spite of every effort on their part to dispose of them. Further than that, repeatedly and continuously since that time they have tried to divest themselves of the ownership of ships for which there is no demand in the world.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator. I think it is very clear from the facts that have been brought out by the Senator from New York that it certainly can not be charged that there is any culpability in the International Mercantile Marine still having title to those ships which fly the British flag. They have been trying for nearly 15 years to get rid of them and, for causes altogether apart from their own desires, they have been prevented from doing so.

Now, let us take the picture as it confronts a citizen of Philadelphia and the railroads which enter that port. Philadelphia is connected to-day with Liverpool by two lines of steamers: First, a collection of little boats extremely slow, of small carrying capacity, operated by the Cunard Line; second, another group of very small boats, very slow, operated by Francis Whitten & Co. Both of those establishments are prominent British-owned shipping companies. If an exporter of meats, for example, is asked to ship his meat to England by way of Philadelphia, he looks about him to see what steamer service is available. He finds these two lines of small slow boats which consume more than two weeks, I am told, in making the voyage. Of course, he says, "I will not ship by Philadelphia. I will send my meats on to New York or to some other port where I can get decently rapid lines of ships." It is very natural that he should take that course. I should add also that the two lines have no refrigerating facilities, and obviously such a shipment, particularly in the summer season, would be a foolish one for an American exporter to make. That is just an illustration of the present handicap.

Seeing that situation, this group of young men, headed by Mr. Kermit Roosevelt, thought they saw an opportunity. They found that the United States Lines, a subsidiary of the International Mercantile Marine, owned two old transports, two vessels which in war time had been used as transports for American troops. They are in pretty good condition in spite of their age. Their mechanical equipment is good. They are capable of about 16 knots speed, and with an out-

lay of about \$125,000 on each of them they can be made into very proper, effective, serviceable cargo and passenger steamers. Their passenger accommodations have not been rehabilitated since war days and, of course, would have to be put in shape. That would cost about \$125,000 each.

These young men, finding that the ships could be bought from the subsidiaries, interested the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, and the Reading Railroad, all of which have Philadelphia terminals, in putting up the money or having it put up to make the down payment on the purchase of those ships. The Philadelphia Mail Steamship Co. was organized at the instance of those three railroads. They have made a contract with the United States Lines for the purchase of the two transports and the possible purchase of two more ships also owned by the United States Lines for the same service.

Having done that, they applied to the Shipping Board for permission to institute this service, stopping at Hampton Roads or Norfolk, then at Baltimore, then at Philadelphia, and thence to Liverpool. Some question arose as to whether the service should be weekly or fortnightly. If the service were weekly, the mail pay under going rates would be about \$1,000,000 a year for the two ships, or about \$500,000 per ship, but if the service is fortnightly, as seems probable, because that is what is preferred by the Post Office Department, the subsidy will be only one-half as much. Instead of being \$1,000,000 a year it will be \$500,000 a year or \$250,000 to each ship. It is highly probable that the fortnightly service will be all that the Post Office Department will authorize.

The proposition was put up to the Shipping Board and at a meeting attended by each of the three members of the Shipping Board and by the president of the Merchant Fleet Corporation and by Mr. Chauncey Parker, the general counsel, as well as some other officials of the board, these facts were laid before the board. The board unanimously approved the project, and said that the line was a desirable one and that it was well for America to take control of that route, which obviously it will do. I am told that within recent days both the Cunard and the Francis Whitten people have stated that if this line begins operation they will have to quit, because they can not compete with 16-knot modern steamships with the little ships they have in the service, and they have both stated that they would go out of the service. Instead of being a British monopoly it will become an American monopoly.

The Shipping Board heard all that; heard the amount of freight that it is possible to originate in Chesapeake Bay, at Baltimore, and at Philadelphia; and unanimously approved it. Joining in that approval was Admiral Cone, the Democratic member of the Shipping Board.

Then the matter went to a board composed of the chairman of the Shipping Board, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce, and that board unanimously approved the project. There was not any secrecy about this. There was no undue hurry. The matter has been investigated for many weeks. Finally, on the authority of those two boards, invitations for bids were sent out by mail inviting people to come in and bid on the operation of the route. After those invitations had been mailed it was discovered that there were certain contradictory statements in them, certain errors in the specifications laid down in the proposal, and a telegram was sent to each of the addressees of the mail communications calling attention to the errors in the letter which had been mailed to him. That is the foundation for the statement made yesterday that the invitation to bid had been sent out by telegraph. It was only the correction of the errors that went out by telegraph. If it had not been for those errors all of the bids would have been in and the contract would have been let to the best bidder on the 20th day of February and this controversy would not be here at all. But because of the clerical mistakes in the invitation and the necessity for correcting them by that subsequent telegram, the date for filing the bids had to be postponed until noon of March 1, to-day.

It has been suggested that the haste which is shown, the unreadiness to postpone the whole business at the suggestion of one Senator, shows of itself a corrupt motive or some concealed impropriety in the transaction. I ask the Senate to consider the merits of that argument. On next Saturday noon the present Government of the United States becomes completely overturned and a new Government takes its place. Obviously a new Shipping Board will come into office. Obviously new Secretaries of Commerce and of the Navy and a new Postmaster General will come into office. They will be confronted with the complete rebuilding of their departments in all probability. They have to learn the details of a thousand matters of pending business. It is perfectly obvious that it will take many months for that new crew to learn its job. It will be months before they will be able to give an instant's thought to this matter.

Is it any wonder that these young men, who are pressing forward with this proposal, which to them seems entirely sound, which has been reviewed and found sound by all of these Federal officials, should be impatient at the prospect of many months of delay? I grant, Mr. President, that these Democratic officials when they come into office will be men of high integrity and will discharge their duties conscientiously. I grant all that and I should expect rather confidently that when they get to it their verdict would be exactly the same as that of all the present high officials who have unanimously said the proposal is all right.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is touching upon a point in the debate now that has interested me from the beginning. I do not profess to have any knowledge about it, but I do confess that I feel that a contract of this magnitude, extending over a long term of years—10 years, I understand—ought not to be passed on by officials just a day or so before they are going out of office.

I am not impressed with the Senator's argument that it is going to take six months to reach this matter. It seems to me the proper thing to do, to avoid all possibility of any suspicion of anything being wrong about it, is to delay it for 30 days or such matter. I do not believe it would take more than that time. I do not like the idea of the Postmaster General, just on the eve of his going out of office, approving a contract of this magnitude extending over a period of years.

I know nothing about the facts the Senator has narrated. I assume the Senator has them all correct, and it would seem on the face of it that there is nothing wrong about it. But a delay of 30 days, it seems to me, would not hinder or interfere with the new officials who are coming into office and who will pass on it and they ought to be allowed an opportunity to do it. That is the thing that impresses me more than anything else.

Mr. REED. I am afraid the Senator's assumption that they would do it in 30 days would not be borne out by the events.

Mr. NORRIS. I should think they could do it in five or six days. I said 30 days because necessarily it would take some time for them to get squared around in their offices. It certainly would not take more than a few hours to look over the record, and if they found it all right they could approve it.

Mr. REED. Well, Mr. President, it has taken weeks for the present officials to study the case. The new Democratic Cabinet heads and other officials are going to be confronted with the whole problem of reorganization of their departments, with budgetary questions, with problems arising out of the depression, and I should be greatly surprised if they were able to give one single moment's consideration to this matter for six months. After all, why should all the business of the Government suspend merely because somebody else has been elected?

I was in warm sympathy with the lame-duck constitutional amendment so well and ably and persistently pre-

sented by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], and I took pleasure in voting for it over and over again as it came before the Senate several times, but in any system, even under his worthy amendment, there is bound to be a hiatus between the election of the new Government and the going out of the old, and it is surely not a correct governmental principle that all work shall stop during that interval.

If no Democrats had taken part in this transaction, I should say that there might be some possible partisan advantage to be gained here, but everybody in the Senate Chamber, Mr. President, and everybody who knows anything about the Shipping Board, concedes the integrity and the fearlessness of Admiral Cone, who is the Democratic member of that board, and it is almost offensive to him to suggest that he is conniving in something which is wrong and which the Democratic administration would not continue.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I am glad the Senator is making the statement he is. Anyone listening to what was said yesterday, as I listened while presiding over the body, that this action had to be taken by noon to-day in order that it might be done under the administration of Postmaster General Brown, would think there was something ulterior on the part of the Postmaster General. I have reread the language that was used in debate yesterday, and there can not be any other inference from it than that the Postmaster General is in the midst of a corrupt deal. Yet the Senator is making a statement that the Postmaster General is simply acting in accordance with the approval of the Shipping Board and with the approval of the other two Cabinet members associated with him in the matter and is merely a routine officer performing his duty without reference to any discretion in the matter at all.

Mr. REED. The Senator is exactly right, except in one respect. It is true that this matter originated before the Shipping Board, and of course the Postmaster General had nothing to do with that. It is true that the proposition was put into its present form by discussions with the Shipping Board and, after the Shipping Board had approved it, it passed it up to a board of four officials, one of whom was the Postmaster General, another of whom was the Secretary of Commerce, another of whom was the Secretary of the Navy, and the fourth was the chairman of the Shipping Board, Mr. O'Connor. That board passed in review upon what the Shipping Board had previously done, and that board unanimously, including the Postmaster General, found that it was all right. So far as I can learn, that was the Postmaster General's first contact with this matter. It did not originate with him. He was not the *deus ex machina* of this plan. It originated with Kermit Roosevelt and his partner, and they put it up to the Shipping Board after they had made arrangements with the three railroads to incorporate the Philadelphia Mail Steamship Co. It was only after all that had happened, and after the Shipping Board, including Admiral Cone, had passed favorably upon this proposal, that it was brought to the attention of Postmaster General Brown.

It is popular in these concluding days of the administration to speak of Postmaster General Brown as if he were the personal devil of the administration. That seems to be stylish. Some of us know that there is no sense in that attitude, but even if Postmaster General Brown were as bad as the most eloquent of our Democratic adversaries has ever said, granting all that, he can not be blamed for this, because he had nothing to do with it at all except, as a member of that last board, to review the proposal and to sign the contract when it is put before him, as I hope it will be in a little while.

Mr. FESS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator for his suggestion.

Mr. President, there will be wonder, perhaps, at the earnestness that I show in this matter. I think the explanation of it may be considered to be this: Let me say, to begin with, that I never heard of the Philadelphia Mail Steamship Co. until about the third day of last month

when they came down here for a hearing before the Shipping Board. I was busy in the Senate, and I could not go to the hearing, but I asked Mr. Huntley, my secretary, to represent me. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] was there for a few minutes at the beginning of the hearings and then had to leave. All the Representatives in Congress from Philadelphia were there, because there is great public interest in this matter. There is desperate unemployment in Philadelphia at this minute; those people are going to have to find another meal to-day and not eight months from to-day; and anything we can do to help business in Philadelphia it is our obvious duty to do.

I became more interested in this question when I discovered that from the time William Penn sailed up the Delaware River in 1681, right down to the year 1915, there never was a time when Philadelphia lacked direct ocean communication with Great Britain. Throughout those centuries there never was a year when she was without it, until in 1915 the disturbances of the war and the plotting of competing lines, which I do not need to go into here because it is all past history, caused the collapse of the steamship company that was operating out of Philadelphia. So from 1915 down to recent years when the Cunard and the Furness Withy lines began sending miserable little slow steamers to Philadelphia, that city has been without any direct communication. The same thing, to a considerable extent, has been true of Baltimore, I understand, and it is only in recent years that Baltimore has begun to take its proper position as an Atlantic seaboard city.

Is it any wonder that the Representatives of Pennsylvania, of Maryland, and of Virginia, who realize that this line will help them by touching at Norfolk or at Hampton Roads, feel an intense interest to see this bargain carried on to consummation?

It is not that we are trying to play any trick on the Government; it is not that Mr. J. P. Morgan, from the middle of his "spider web," is concocting some scheme to extort an unjustified bounty from the United States. He has no more to do with it than I have with the government of Timbuktu. He does not stand to profit from it in any possible degree, and to come here and to charge that J. P. Morgan and the Chase National Bank are behind this scheme is simply making a wild statement for which there is not one iota of substance or foundation.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, the Senator made the statement that there is no basis for the statement made by me. Does he desire to yield now to have me insert in the *Record* the list of directorships held by officers of this company, which he says is controlled by young men, showing their connection with numerous Morgan banks and numerous Morgan interests?

Mr. REED. The Senator put that in the *Record* yesterday.

Mr. BLACK. No; I did not, but I have it all here from the directory of directories.

Mr. REED. Yes; I know the Senator has that. The Senator has an old list of the directors of the International Mercantile Marine.

Mr. BLACK. I am not talking about the International Mercantile Marine. I am talking about the young president—young Mr. Franklin, as the Senator has said. He is a director or otherwise connected with the following corporations: Atlantic Mutual Insurance Co., Atlantic Transport Co., Columbian Steamship Co., Engineers' Public Service Co., National City Bank, National Surety Co., Northern Insurance Co. of New York, Ocean Transport Co. (Inc.), Santander Navigation Corporation, Seamen's Bank for Savings in the City of New York, Terminal Warehouse Co., Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co., White Rock Mineral Springs Co., and New York Indemnity Co.

I can take each one of the men that the Senator referred to as "this young group," and can show that some of them

are directors in Morgan banks, in the Chase National Bank, in the National City Bank, and in all the various Morgan interests that were shown by what the Senator referred to as the "spider web" a few minutes ago.

Mr. REED. If the Senator will show that they are directors of J. P. Morgan & Co., he is performing a wonder, because J. P. Morgan & Co. is a partnership and they do not have any directors.

Mr. BLACK. I did not say "J. P. Morgan & Co." I said banks and other vehicles used by J. P. Morgan & Co. through interlocking directors. J. P. Morgan, of course, does not operate the Guaranty Trust Co. under the name of J. P. Morgan & Co., but everybody knows he operates it; and I can show the Senator that some of these young men to whom he refers are directors in the Guaranty Trust Co., some of them in the Chase National Bank, some of them in the National City Bank, and other corporations, which it was shown a short time ago were all interlocking with each other and are the beneficiaries of the subsidies which the Government pays.

Mr. REED. If the Senator thinks that that kind of argument proves anything, I am going to leave him to the gratification of his own eloquence.

Mr. BLACK. Would the Senator object to my reading the list of directorships held by Mr. John W. Hanes?

Mr. REED. I do not object at all. It rather brightens up my speech.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Hanes is a director in the Vick Chemical Co., Motor Improvements (Inc.), Investors Equity Co., Reynolds Investing Co., Reynolds Metals Co., General Realty & Utilities Corporation, Aviation Corporation, Selected Industries (Inc.), Commercial National Corporation, Reybarn Co. (Inc.), U. S. Foil Co., Thompson-Starrett Co., Roosevelt Field (Inc.), Marine Union Investors (Inc.), Bankers' Trust Co., Case, Pomeroy & Co., Thomas Young Nurseries (Inc.), Vick Financial Co., Southern Corporation, and Bankers Co.

I can show the Senator, if he wants me to show it, that he is also director in Stone & Webster Co. and various other interests that were mentioned a few days ago. These are simply some of the young men the Senator says have control of this purely philanthropic movement.

Mr. REED. As I said before, if that proves anything to the Senator, he is welcome to it, and he will doubtless find that they belong to some clubs and churches, too.

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I find that some of them are connected with churches, and I can show that some of these young men also are connected as directors with various publications.

Mr. REED. The Senator must mean then that the Philadelphia Steamship Co. is going to be controlled by the White Rock Mineral Springs Co. and No. 1 Broadway Corporation and the Presbyterian Church.

Mr. BLACK. Yes; if there is any money to be gathered in more than they have already fleeced the public out of; that is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a question for my own information. Would the Senator be in favor of this contract and its execution of it by the Postmaster General if the institutions to which he has referred were not interested, as he alleges?

Mr. BLACK. I would not be in favor of this contract under any circumstances or conditions.

Mr. BAILEY. That is what I thought. So the mention of these institutions, then, is mainly by way of prejudice; it is not by way of argument?

Mr. BLACK. No. The mention of these men is, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield—

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. It is because of the fact that the Senator from Pennsylvania made a statement that they were not connected in any way with the Morgan interests or the

Chase National Bank or the National City Bank, and I brought this in to show that they are. That was the object.

Mr. BAILEY. So that the matter is wholly incidental and does not relate to the merits of the question?

Mr. BLACK. I desire to state that I would be opposed to this contract whoever might make it, and that it is my belief that the particular group to which I have referred are the ones who are behind the vast stripping of the taxpayers of this country by the subsidies which have heretofore been granted; that there is a scheme and a system on their part which they have utilized to the fullest extent, and that the overwhelming portion of the great subsidies which have heretofore been paid have gone into their pockets for their private profit.

Mr. BAILEY. And still, as the Senator says, he would be against this contract if all the institutions and men to whom he refers were eliminated from the contract.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is correct. I would be against it because I believe it is wrong, because I believe it is unjust, and further because I do not personally believe there would have been any effort to get through such a contract if this group had not been behind it. I do not think it could have gotten to first base.

Mr. BAILEY. I was trying to find out what relation these institutions and corporations and men had to this contract. I do not get that.

Mr. BLACK. If the Senator will yield further, I will state that it is by reason of the fact that they are directors of the company which will operate these steamships.

Mr. BAILEY. Still, that does not relate them to the controversy.

Mr. BLACK. It relates them to the controversy to this extent: It is my judgment that an investigation of the subsidy will show that there has been an unfair system and scheme planned and devised, largely by the master minds in this group of banking interests in New York, and that they have taken advantage of that situation and wielded their immense power to extract the taxpayers' money, as they say, legally, through subsidies; but according to my belief, while some of it may be within the law, it is wrong none the less.

Mr. BAILEY. But the Senator does not relate these corporations and men to the controversy itself or to the contract. He would be against the contract under any circumstances.

Mr. BLACK. I would be against this contract; and I do not think the ordinary citizen who depends upon self-initiative and his own ability to make his living ever would have proposed any such contract. I think it is only those who have been accustomed to growing wealthy, not by their own initiative and their own aggressiveness and their own ability, but by chicanery and manipulation of stocks, privileges, and high tariffs fostering monopolies, and that this is a part of the same old system that has been going on, and is legalized graft.

Mr. BAILEY. Nevertheless, if the corporation getting the contract were owned by poor and unknown men, the Senator would still be opposed to it?

Mr. BLACK. I would still be opposed to this contract. My own judgment is that poor men never would have had any chance to get anywhere with it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there is one other fact in this matter which has not been alluded to by anybody, and that is that the International Mercantile Marine and the Roosevelt Steamship Co. (Inc.) will not participate in this mail subvention at all. It will go entirely to the Philadelphia Mail Steamship Co.; so that even if Mr. Morgan still owns his one share, and even if he had not resigned as a director two years ago, and even if, by ownership of that one share and his membership on the board, he controlled the International Mercantile Marine, he would not get a single penny of these mail payments that are to be made. It will go entirely to this little Philadelphia company, the Philadelphia Mail Steamship Co., because it has the mail contract and gets the mail pay, and not the International Mercantile Marine.

There we are. Out of a few suspicions and a few big names has been built a perfect mountain of imaginary crime. There is not one iota of proof to sustain the statement so often made here yesterday that this contract is corrupt.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Gladly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Passing over the immediate subject of the Senator's discussion, what has the Senator to say about the proposal to rush these contracts through on the 1st of March—contracts which will bind the Government for a period of 10 years; contracts which might rest upon their merit and be passed over two or three days and be considered by the incoming administration, which is to have charge of the Government for the next four years? Are there any circumstances which make the matter emergent and which demand action to-day at 12 o'clock, just 25 minutes from this time, rather than subsequent to the 4th of March?

Mr. REED. I am very glad indeed that my friend has asked that question, Mr. President, because when he was called from the floor I had tried to explain that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I will not ask the Senator to repeat it. I was called out, as the Senator says.

Mr. REED. It will be well worth my while to answer it again, because doubtless there are other Senators here who did not hear the statement at that time.

They have been working on this contract for weeks, Mr. President. It was finally brought up to the Shipping Board and by them examined most thoroughly. Hearings were had, and a unanimous vote taken by the Shipping Board, including Admiral Cone.

We know that the Shipping Board is certain to be changed in personnel after the 4th of March. We are led to expect that Admiral Cone will be kept on as the Democratic chairman. Those who know his work say that he has earned it; but, obviously, one of the Republicans will be dropped and a Democrat put on in his place.

The next step after the Shipping Board had acted after that hearing was that the matter then was taken before a board of review of four persons, consisting of the chairman of the Shipping Board, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Postmaster General. That was the Postmaster General's first contact with this matter, by the way; and that board of review was similarly unanimous in passing upon the matter.

The bids have been sent out. They were sent out a considerable time ago by mail. Then they had to be corrected by telegram. If that had not been so, this whole matter would have been cleaned up on February 20; but, because of a clerical error in the invitations, telegrams had to be sent out, and that is the reason for the delay to the 1st of March.

The matter has taken weeks to work up to this point and to arrive at this conclusion. If we should wait until after the 4th of March we would have to start in again at the very bottom, with new officials coming into new duties which they will necessarily take time to master. I grant that the subject will meet with the same fairness when they get around to it that it is meeting with now; but it will be many months before the new Democratic officials, in the pressure of their work, will be able to give it the thorough attention that it needs, and we are desperately in need of the work. Philadelphia needs this steamship service. I explained while the Senator was out how we are utterly unable to compete with the two British lines there to-day, but how both of them will be mastered by these new swift steamers; and it means an immense lot of business for Philadelphia. That is my reason for haste.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Gladly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It seems to me, notwithstanding the circumstances to which the Senator has re-

ferred, that if the Government is to be bound for a period of 10 years respecting these contracts, the administration which is just coming in ought to be given an opportunity to pass upon them. In other words, what is the haste? What is the meaning of the language read into the RECORD by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] yesterday or some previous day in which it was stated that unless these contracts are made before the present administration goes out they will not be made at all? Why is it assumed that that is the case?

Mr. REED. I did not see that statement. I saw the statement that there was need for haste; yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The statement was read into the RECORD by the Senator from Alabama, and I called the attention of the Senate to it yesterday, that it is imperative that every possible haste be made—

Mr. REED. That is right.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That the contract be closed on this date, the 1st of March; that otherwise the contract probably will not be made at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. If I may interject, I think the Senator from Pennsylvania himself in substance made that statement yesterday.

Mr. REED. I did not mean to couple the latter part.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Assuming, as the Senator has stated, that fair consideration will be given to the matter after the 4th of March, how is it that the conclusion is reached by those making the contract that it will not be entered into unless entered into immediately?

Mr. REED. That is not my conclusion, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania further yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday the Senator from Pennsylvania is quoted as saying:

Does the Senator remember the touching consideration that Pennsylvania got from the last Democratic administration? Does not the Senator know full well that this contract never will be signed on any terms for any Philadelphia concern?

Mr. REED. I must confess that the Senator has made his point. We all make statements in the heat of debate that we wish we had not made, and that is the case here. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator does not wish, then, to stand on that statement?

Mr. REED. No; I do not think so. I will admit that the joke is on me there; but, Mr. President, here is a very serious factor, speaking of the humorous side of this matter: If this contract is executed now, to run for 10 years, it is only right and just that that should be done, because for 6 out of those 10 years it will be a Republican administration that will have to work under it; whereas if we postpone its execution to March 4 this 10-year contract will be executed by a Democratic administration, which will have only four years' control of it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator from Pennsylvania is indulging in a form of classic humor that does not amuse me. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. I would not expect it to amuse the Senator from Arkansas. I should expect it to pain him to the heart. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I add that while I recognize the Senator as a great Senator and an able lawyer, I do not regard him as a prophet.

Mr. REED. I have never posed as being a prophet, Mr. President. I have discovered that most human beings who do get themselves into trouble, and that is why I do not

think the slightest attention should be paid to the prophecy read by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] a minute ago.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. COPELAND. I desire to ask the Senator a question. I do not know whether he heard what I said yesterday about the efforts being made by British shipping interests to control the action of the coming economic conference.

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President; I was called from the Chamber shortly after the Senator began.

Mr. COPELAND. To repeat just a word I said yesterday, the British Chamber of Commerce for Shipping, at a meeting a few days ago, formulated resolutions to be presented to the British Government, and, among other of these resolutions, was one which provided for an appeal to the British Government to have the delegates who are to serve in the economic conference—and some of whom are to come here for conversations before—to make every effort to induce the delegates of other countries to band together with the British delegates against all these aids for shipping which we have undertaken in this country.

I think this is no reflection upon the British Government but it does demonstrate that British shipping interests are striving in every possible way to hamstring the American merchant marine.

Mr. REED. There is no question about that.

Mr. COPELAND. I want to ask the Senator this question: What will be the effect upon those advocates of that policy in the British shipping interests if it is heralded abroad, reported in the London Times and other papers, that the United States Senate has passed a resolution condemning the authorities of our Government in continuing the policy which we established when we passed the Jones-White Act?

Mr. REED. I should think they would be very much enheartened by the news.

Mr. COPELAND. Naturally so.

Mr. REED. And I should think the Cunard Line and the Furness-Withy Line, who will continue to hold their monopoly of the Philadelphia-Baltimore-Liverpool service, would be perfectly delighted to know that the American Senate had prevented an American line from competing with them.

Mr. COPELAND. It seems to me, if the Senator will bear with me, that that is sure to be the effect. I remember that at one time Stevenson, in his philosophical idea of things, when asked what he would do if he were suddenly told that he was to die to-morrow, said, "Well, it would be my duty then to do to-day exactly as I had expected to do to-morrow."

As I conceive the duty of officials, in theory, at least, they do not know that the administration is ending. The business of Government must go on. There are certain measures now which, to my knowledge, are pending before the Shipping Board which have to do with the extension of loans. It is not right for the Shipping Board to stop functioning because we are to have a change of administration on the 4th of March. I do think that it is a very unfortunate thing that this particular important contract should have been acted upon at so late a time.

Mr. REED. But this is of small importance compared with a lot that have gone through without any such fuss.

Mr. COPELAND. That is true, and, of course, if this had gone through six months ago there would not have been a word said.

Mr. REED. Not a word.

Mr. COPELAND. But I am greatly concerned, for if we pass this resolution—and with certain whereases in it I would not be unwilling to vote for it, perhaps—I fear that we would be doing the shipping industry in America great harm by that sort of thing.

Mr. REED. I think we would. But I think I ought to say here, in justice to the Senator from Alabama, that I do not for one moment believe that he is trying to help the British shipping industry as against the American. I know that is

not his motive, and he does not need to disclaim it, because I will do that for him.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator will bear with me, I will say so, too.

Mr. REED. But I am sure that what the Senator is trying to do would be of vast benefit to the Cunard and Furness-Withy lines, and would be of great injury to American shipping, and would substantially handicap us in the coming economic conference.

We are going to find the nations of Europe ganging up on us in many things, and this is one of many. I would be sorry to see the American Senate furnish fuel for their fire by taking such action as is proposed.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BLAINE. It gets down to this with me: Is there any real necessity for any further extension of the ocean mail service? The present facilities have taken care of all the needs in the past, and will they not take care of them in the future? As I look over the schedule, it seems that some of the ships carry only a few pounds of mail.

Mr. REED. It is true of some lines that they are carrying only a few hundred pounds, but providing for the carriage of the mails was not the only motive the Congress had in enacting the Jones-White law. We wanted to see the American flag flying on the seven seas, and we took the only possible way of doing it.

Mr. BLAINE. In these times there are a lot of things we can not do that we would like to do.

Mr. REED. I agree with that.

Mr. BLAINE. This may be one of them.

Mr. REED. I do not think this is one of them, and the Shipping Board after an examination of the project is unanimous in saying it is not one of them.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is entirely right when he says what he does about the purpose of the Jones-White Act. When we debated the matter here in the Senate, we never contended for a moment that the mail pay was for actual service rendered alone. Our endeavor was to build up an effective American merchant marine. We have conditions to deal with different from those in other lands. It costs two or three times as much to build an American ship in an American shipyard as it does to build one abroad. By reason of the La Follette Acts, which were intended, and properly so, to guard American seamen, it costs more to operate a ship under the American flag, because there are restrictions on the hours of labor, and requirements as to the air space, and sanitary provisions, which are not in the shipping laws of other countries. So, when we discussed all these matters in connection with the Jones-White Act, we frankly said that the object was more than simply to pay for the poundage of the mail. It was in order that there might be built up an American merchant marine, so that American manufacturers and merchants and agriculturalists could send their products in American bottoms and receive raw materials in this country in American bottoms. That was the purpose.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator has described exactly what will happen if this contract goes through. The Furness-Withy Co. will withdraw its small, slow boats from the Philadelphia service. The Cunard Line has stated that it will do the same thing. They both admit that those small ships will be replaced by two fast, modernized American ships, which will keep up a sufficient service under the American flag to take care of the whole route. How can any American doubt the desirability of that? That will mean the employment of American sailors, it will mean increased activity in the ports which are served by these lines. Hampton Roads, Baltimore, Philadelphia, all will take on new life because of it. How can any American want to postpone that for months in times like these by taking such action as is proposed? When we were asked to give relief to other communities we did not hang back and say, "Oh,

well, we will postpone it to the new Congress and give it to you a month from now." We have cooperated with the other States in giving aid as promptly as we could, and we ask the same treatment now of our sister States.

The suggestion is made that the Shipping Board and these Cabinet heads should not act before the 4th of March on this matter. If we apply that suggestion to other activities of the Government, we will see how wrong it is. Do we stop voting here because we are to go out of office on the 4th of March? Do Senators cease from voting and speaking and remain passive, and let their successors perform all their functions? Of course they do not. The accumulation of business during the three months of the interim would be too great. Every day, in every department of the Government, discretionary decisions are being made, and that will continue right up to the 4th of March, and it ought to, in any administration. I should say the same thing four years from now, when the Democratic departments will be continuing their activities right up to the 4th of March. It has to be done.

In the Treasury Department, in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, hundreds of decisions are being made right now and will continue to be made up to the 4th of March, and that was done by the Democrats in 1921, and properly so. I never could discover that there was anything worse in the quality of those decisions than had been found in the quality of the decisions made before the election.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. REED. I would rather not have a vote now. Let us take up something else.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator if we can not take a vote now. We have been told these contracts will be entered into at 12 o'clock.

Mr. REED. That is true.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Of course, we all know that the Senator can occupy the floor until after 12 o'clock and further complicate the matter, but I am wondering whether the Senator wishes to do that.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not want the Senate to take action on this resolution. I have tried in all sincerity to explain the facts this morning, and there has not been any time I have been speaking when there have been more than 20 Senators present. That is not through any discourtesy toward me, but it is because they are all exceedingly busy. But if we take a vote on the resolution now, it will necessarily be an uninformed vote, except on the part of those few Senators who have done me the honor to listen to my statement of facts this morning.

It is a senseless thing for me to be wasting time prolonging argument on this. I have talked to the point and nothing but the point since the Senate met this morning. But I have stated my entire knowledge of the matter, and while I do not intend to permit a vote, I would suggest that it would be wise on the part of the Senate to occupy itself in something useful instead of compelling me to waste time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I ask the Senator what he means by the statement that he will not permit the Senate to vote, after he has announced that he has concluded his argument?

Mr. REED. I do not think it is fair or right, or within the province of the Senate, to interfere with this administrative act, and I shall argue that phase of the matter at some length, unless the Senate wishes to take up some other matter at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I say to the Senator, if he will be good enough to yield to me just a second—

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That it occurs to me that he is doing just the thing which from time to time has been done here by other Senators. After the debate has been fairly exhausted, he announces his purpose to take advantage of the rule of the Senate which permits one who gets the floor to talk as long as he pleases on any subject he chooses to speak about, and thus prevent a decision by the Senate. It occurs to me that we ought to have a vote on

this resolution, and that the Senator is hardly in a position to say that he will not permit the Senate to act.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have been a member of the Senate for 10 years, and I have seen filibusters carried on from both sides of the aisle. I remember vividly when we had before us a measure called the Dyer antilynching bill, and the Democratic leader at that time, Senator Underwood, rose and stated frankly that there was to be a filibuster, that that bill would never be permitted to come to a vote. We saw the absurd spectacle of the Senate being forced to spend two weeks in a discussion of the question whether the approval of the Journal of the first day should be had.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. In just a moment. My good friend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] improved the occasion by speaking for hours upon the question whether the Chaplain's prayer should be included in full in the Journal of the Senate.

In spite of the absurdity of the situation, I will say, if I may, that he made a most extraordinarily clever and amusing speech, but it was not so amusing to those who were responsible for the business that was pressing for action.

Now I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator now announces his purpose to follow the very example which he condemns.

Mr. REED. It is a dreadful example and I am sorry the Senator forces me to follow it. I might say that I do not approve at all of the rule permitting unlimited debate. I should be strongly in favor of a rule which would not permit me to do what I am doing at this minute, deliberately preventing a vote on this resolution. I am doing it because I am apprehensive that the Senate would probably take snap judgment, because most of the Senators who sit here have not heard the arguments and because I think in all probability the snap judgment, which I am apprehensive would be taken, would be an injustice to the State which I represent and to its neighbor States, Maryland and Virginia.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator admits that if the Senate should take a vote it would agree to the resolution?

Mr. REED. No; I do not admit it at all.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Then, what did the Senator mean by saying the Senate would take snap judgment?

Mr. REED. I am apprehensive it would do so. I can be apprehensive of it without knowing it. The Senator called attention a few minutes ago that I am not a prophet, and he thinks I would make a very poor one, so I am not going to try to prophesy what the vote would be, but I feel apprehensive.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I know the Senator is a poor prophet when he undertakes to say what will be the result of the political election four years hence. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, that is not a prophecy; it is a certainty. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator has again demonstrated a peculiar quality of assurance. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. I am so confident of that event that I do not feel the need of proving my assertion or calling any witnesses to substantiate my statement.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. FESS, and others addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I will yield first to the Senator from Oklahoma, who rose first, I believe.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I want to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question to see if I understand his purpose. The Senator is now engaged in what is sometimes termed a filibuster?

Mr. REED. For about half an hour. I shall not talk nearly as long as the Senator from Oklahoma did in his last filibuster.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator will talk long enough to accomplish his purpose?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is all I have ever tried to do. If that is true, the Senator is occupied at this time in endeavoring to keep the Senate from going on record on a matter as to which, in the opinion of the Senator, they would make a mistake if they did go on record at this time.

Mr. REED. Oh, no, Mr. President; not at all.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I understand the Senator's position to be that if we should take a vote on the pending resolution, we would probably pass the resolution and that would be a mistake.

Mr. REED. No; not at all. I am apprehensive the Senate might do so. The Senator will understand that a good many Senators heard the arguments yesterday when, if I may say it in slang, "the bloody shirt was waved" and it was explained that this must necessarily be corrupt because J. P. Morgan & Co. and the Chase National Bank were behind it. I have demonstrated this morning that the Chase National Bank and J. P. Morgan & Co. have not anything whatever to do with it, but most of the Senators did not hear me. They were busy on other matters.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK. I have been here and heard the Senator, but I did not hear the Senator make any such demonstration.

Mr. REED. The Senator's reasoning abilities and mine do not seem to march in common.

Mr. BLACK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I understood the Senator to say that he does not approve of filibusters and that filibusters are wrong fundamentally, but that occasionally, in order to keep the Senate from doing an unwise act, it is necessary to have a filibuster for the purpose indicated.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; not quite that. In order to keep the Senate from doing a greater wrong I am resorting to the somewhat preposterous custom of filibustering for half an hour.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Of course the Senator feels that he is justified in that filibuster?

Mr. REED. I am justified in doing what I am doing to prevent a greater wrong.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Will the Senator please explain to the Senate, so it may appear in the RECORD and harmonize his position in being opposed to a rule which permits unlimited debate, and then taking advantage of the rule when, as he has just stated, he feels justified in so doing?

Mr. REED. I think we ought to be doing something useful, and I am going to be in favor of remaining in session a half hour later to-night so the country will not be the loser by this proceeding.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have just succeeded in getting an interpretation from the Senator, because since I have been here he has engaged in the same kind of filibuster, as well as others.

Mr. REED. The Senator does not reproach me for it?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Oh, no! I am not criticizing the Senator. It is the only weapon we have. I have used it myself. All that I have been able to obtain at the hands of the Senate I have obtained through a filibuster.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK. I understand the Senator to say he is only going to filibuster half an hour?

Mr. REED. About that long.

Mr. BLACK. Then, may I ask the Senator if he has any assurance from Mr. Walter F. Brown that he is going to sign the contract at 12.30 o'clock?

Mr. REED. I have not had the slightest communication with Mr. Brown.

Mr. BLACK. Did the Senator have that assurance from the gentleman with whom he talked over the long-distance telephone in connection with this contract?

Mr. REED. The Senator is making a statement which I am sure that he would regret after reflection, but I will answer his question. I did not talk to anybody over the long-distance telephone.

Mr. BLACK. I understood the Senator to say that he did.

Mr. REED. No.

Mr. BLACK. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. REED. Not on this or any other subject.

Mr. BLACK. I understood the Senator to say he did so talk last night.

Mr. REED. Oh, no.

Mr. BLACK. Then I withdraw that part of my statement.

Mr. REED. And I withdraw the sharpness with which I replied.

Mr. BLACK. I desire to ask the Senator if he had any assurance from the gentleman with whom he talked, wherever he talked with him—

Mr. REED. The facts I gave to the Senate to-day were given to me yesterday and this morning by a vice president of the International Mercantile Marine. The statement that I was going to speak until 12.30 o'clock was based on an assurance from my secretary that this matter would be acted on by that time.

Mr. BLACK. Will the Senator state to whom his secretary talked and from whom he got that assurance?

Mr. REED. He does not say in his memorandum to me.

Mr. BLACK. Would the Senator object to reading it aloud?

Mr. REED. Yes; I do. I do not think that is required.

Mr. BLACK. I understand that the Senator has assurance indirectly through his secretary that if he can keep the Senate from acting until 12.30 o'clock there will be action on this matter by Postmaster General Brown.

Mr. REED. No; I have not said anything of the sort. I will read the memorandum of my secretary:

The Shipping Board probably will break up about 12.30.

That is the extremely interesting message from my secretary.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is willing for us to vote at 12.30?

Mr. REED. I do not care what the Senate does, but I do not intend that it shall apply lynch law to the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. BLACK. So far as that is concerned, the Senator may continue until he gets tired, but we take the position that this is looting the Treasury; and we would prefer, even if the Senator's statement is correct, to have happened what he has said would happen rather than to have a looting of the Treasury.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I am interested to know, in the light of the background of facts that the Senator has given of the procedure leading up to the signing of this contract, whether the Senator from Pennsylvania or any Senator would feel that if the Senate would take a vote now and vote adversely, that would have any effect whatever upon signing the contract, even though we did it before the contract is signed. I would like to know whether the Senator feels that the contracting parties would pay any attention to what we might do in the light of the facts the Senator has now stated.

Mr. REED. I am glad the Senator asked that question. I have not talked with the Postmaster General about this, and I do not know how he feels about it. But if I were Postmaster General, I should pay no attention whatsoever to the passage of the resolution by the Senate. Here is the reason why I would not do so: The Congress, with the approval of the President, has enacted the Jones-White law. If I, as an executive official, should be convinced of the fairness and legality of a proposed contract and of its advantages to the United States, I should go ahead and not permit Congress, by a resolution of one branch of it without the acquiescence of the other branch and without the approval of the President, to repeal that act in effect. If I were the Postmaster General, I would not pay the slightest attention to the pending resolution if it were passed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. In view of what the Senator has now stated, will he consent to a vote at 12.30 o'clock?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and that at 12.30 o'clock p. m. we take a vote on the pending resolution without further debate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope that will be agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I gave notice a few days ago of my desire and intention to propose taking up a House bill having to do with the development of American air transport services overseas. I want to make it the unfinished business and then lay it aside temporarily to take up the appropriation bill. I would like to have the Senator include in his request that provision with reference to the House bill to which I have adverted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I had hoped to get consideration during the day of a bill which was discussed at some length here the other day, the bill (S. 5639) providing for loans or advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the purpose of securing a postponement of the foreclosure of certain mortgages for a period of two years, and for other purposes. I am sure that we ought to be able to dispose of that in a short time.

Mr. McNARY. I want to cooperate with the Senator, and I am sure that the bill will take only a short time. If he will modify his proposal to include the House bill to which I have referred, H. R. 8681, I shall be glad to consent.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. How long does the Senator think it will take to dispose of that bill?

Mr. McNARY. I think we can dispose of it in a short time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does the bill involve a subsidy?

Mr. McNARY. No. It has passed the House and has a national importance. It provides for no subsidy. It does not take effect until three years from the time it shall be passed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I will modify my requests with that assurance and the assurance of Senators on this side of the Chamber, who are familiar with it, that the bill which the Senator from Oregon has in mind will not require very much time. Of course, while it is under consideration one can move to proceed to the consideration of another matter. I ask that we proceed to the consideration of the bill referred to by the Senator from Oregon, H. R. 8681, to develop American transport services overseas, and so forth, and that at 12.30 o'clock p. m. to-day we vote on the resolution of the Senator from Alabama without further debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, may I ask what the bill of the Senator from Oregon is?

Mr. McNARY. It is to develop American air transport services overseas.

Mr. BLACK. Much as I regret to do it and interested as I am in securing a vote on the resolution which I have offered, I can not believe that it is proper to couple the Senator's measure with the pending proposal of the Senator from Arkansas, because that bill raises again the question of subsidy by mail contracts.

Mr. McNARY. I think not.

Mr. BLACK. Very well. I shall not object, but I understand it does.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I understand the situation with reference to the matter which the Senator from Arkansas mentions, the postponement of mortgage foreclosures. Is that included in the unanimous-consent agreement and is it to follow consideration of the bill which the Senator from Oregon mentions?

Mr. McNARY. No; that was not included, but I think the general opinion among Senators is that it should be.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, because of the conversations being carried on in the Chamber it was impossible to hear the statement of the Senator from Oregon. Will he repeat it?

Mr. McNARY. I stated that the Hull-Walcott bill is not included in the proposal of the Senator from Arkansas, but I think it is the general consensus of opinion that it should be.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I will state to the Senator from Idaho and to the Senator from Oregon, too, that if the bill to which the Senator from Oregon refers, the bill to develop American air transport services overseas, should require any considerable length of time in discussion, and if the expectation of the Senator from Oregon is not met, I shall move, if someone else does not do so, to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 5639 having relation to the postponement of mortgage foreclosures.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator from Alabama if he will strike from his resolution the whereases which I discussed with him privately?

Mr. BLACK. I am perfectly willing to eliminate a part of them.

Mr. COPELAND. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COPELAND. When it comes time to vote on this question, would it be proper then to make any changes in the resolution which is pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule the resolution must be agreed to first; then the question comes on agreeing to the preamble, and it may then be amended or rejected. If the preamble were stricken out first, there would have to be some changes made in the body of the resolution.

Mr. COPELAND. May I ask the Senator from Alabama if he will not make the changes in order that we may not be estopped when the time comes for the vote and be unable to vote upon the modifications?

Mr. BLACK. I do not want the Senator to be estopped, and I do not understand that the Senator from Arkansas intended that we should do anything except vote upon the resolution or any amendment that might be proposed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not think I said that. I include the words "any amendment that may be offered." Let us save a little time, if we can.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COPELAND. Would it be in order to offer an amendment before we vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be, as the Chair understands the Senator from Arkansas now to frame his request, the words "or any amendment thereto" having been added. Is there objection?

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, there is pending on the calendar House bill 13991, commonly known as the allotment bill. It seems to me that there should be some time given to that bill at this session. It has passed the House; it was considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate for, I think, two or three weeks;

hearings were held on it; it was amended somewhat. I should like to get the bill before the Senate and, at least, have it discussed on the floor and some action taken upon it at this session. At the first opportunity I am going to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] as modified? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill, the title of which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8681) to develop American air transport services overseas, to encourage the construction in the United States by American capital of American airships for use in foreign commerce, and to make certain provisions of the maritime law applicable to foreign commerce by airship.

PURCHASE AND SALE OF COTTON BY THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, before yielding to the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5122) to provide for the purchase and sale of cotton under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That there is hereby created in the Department of Agriculture a cotton board (hereinafter referred to as the board). Such board shall consist of six members, to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, all of whom shall be qualified and experienced in either the purchasing, handling, or production of cotton. The members of the board shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be paid their actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties. They shall hold office during the pleasure of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Farm Board, and all other departments and agencies of the Government are hereby directed—

(a) To sell to the said cotton board at such price as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the board all cotton now owned by them.

(b) To take such action and to make such settlements as are necessary in order to acquire full legal title to all cotton on which money has been loaned or advanced, upon such terms as they may deem fair and just, and to sell this cotton also to the board in the same manner as is provided in the preceding paragraph hereof.

Sec. 3. The board shall have authority to borrow money upon all cotton in its possession or control and deposit as collateral for such loans the warehouse receipts for such cotton.

Sec. 4. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to advance money and to make loans to the board in such amounts and upon such terms as may be agreed upon by the board and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with such warehouse receipts as collateral security.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, is hereby authorized and directed to enter into contracts with the producers of cotton to sell to any such producer an amount of cotton, in the hands of the board, equivalent in amount to the amount of reduction in production of cotton by such producer below the amount produced by him in the preceding crop year, in all cases where such producer agrees in writing to reduce the amount of cotton produced by him in 1933, below his production in the previous year, by not less than 30 per cent, without increase in commercial fertilization per acre.

To any such producer so agreeing to reduce production the Secretary of Agriculture shall deliver a nonnegotiable option contract agreeing to sell to said producer an amount of cotton equivalent to the amount of his estimated reduction of the cotton in the possession and control of the board.

The producer is to have the option to buy said cotton at the average price paid by the board for the cotton procured under section 2 and is to have the right at any time up to January 1, 1934, to exercise his option, upon proof that he has complied with his contract and with all the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect thereto, by taking said cotton upon payment by him of his option price and all actual carrying charges on such cotton; or the board may sell such cotton for the account of such producer, paying him the excess of the market price at the date of sale over the market price at the date of his contract after deducting all actual and necessary carrying charges: *Provided*, That in no event shall the producer be held responsible or liable for financial loss incurred in the holding of such cotton or on account of the carrying charges therein: *Provided further*, That such agreement to curtail cotton production shall contain a fur-

ther provision that such cotton producer shall not use the land taken out of cotton production for the production for sale, directly or indirectly, of any other nationally produced agricultural commodity or product.

Sec. 6. The board shall sell the cotton held by it at its discretion: *Provided*, That it shall dispose of all cotton held by it by March 1, 1935: *Provided further*, That the board is authorized to sell unlimited amounts, at any time a price equivalent to not less than 10 cents basis middling seven-eighths inch staple at the ports can be procured.

Sec. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to make all necessary rules and regulations and to employ such officers and employees as are necessary to execute the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That no salary or compensation shall be paid to any person in excess of that paid to Federal employees for like or similar services.

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] took quite an interest in this bill, and I understand offered certain amendments to it. I believe he is not in the Chamber. Is it in order to object to the motion?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I had not heretofore noted the absence of the Senator from Utah. Of course, I do not want to take advantage of his absence.

Mr. GORE. I object if the request is for unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection does not carry the matter over.

Mr. KING entered the Chamber.

Mr. McNARY. I note the Senator from Utah has returned to the Chamber, and I ask the clerk again to state the title of the bill in the amendment of the House to which I have moved to concur.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The title of the bill will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 5122) to provide for the purchase and sale of cotton under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am surprised at the action of the House in respect to the measure which is now before us, and I can not understand the haste with which the bill is being pressed for passage in this body. The measure passed by the Senate dealing with the cotton in the hands of certain Government agencies contained a number of provisions which afforded some little protection to the Government and to the people. The House discarded the Senate bill and has transmitted to the Senate the measure now before us. Perhaps my observations are a little too general for the reason that I have not had an opportunity to read the House bill and have not learned of many of its provisions. I am advised that the House has written practically a new bill, in which, as stated, important provisions of the Senate bill were eliminated.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. KING. In a moment. In order that I may be advised of the provisions of the bill before us, I desire to have the clerk read it for my information if not for the information of the Senate. It is my opinion that very few Senators know the action of the House or the terms of the bill now before us. I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, there was in the bill a provision for the purchase of Red Cross cotton which is now being offered, as I understand, below the market. The Senator from Utah objected to that, and that provision went out. Section 4, providing that the cotton might be purchased from farmers who were being distressed by the banks, also went out. So the bill simply provides that the cotton now owned and controlled by the Government shall be put in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture who, through the board that is set up, without pay, shall allow the farmers to take options on the cotton and agree to reduce their acreage, bale for bale, according to the amount they take under their

options, and that by March, 1935, the cotton shall all be disposed of and the Government be relieved of its holdings.

As matters now stand, Mr. President, the Senator will appreciate that if the Government dumps its cotton on the market, with the conditions now existing, it will further depress the price. If the Government gets out of it, and turns it over to the farmers whose options will be exercised on that cotton, and that cotton alone, and who will reduce their acreage in accordance with their options taken, it will get rid of the surplus to that extent; the acreage will be reduced, and, therefore, there will not be any reproduction of the surplus, and benefit will inure to the entire country if cotton rises in price in consequence thereof, which we all confidently believe it will.

I have heard no objections from any parties interested in cotton, from the man who makes the cloth down to the man who grows the raw material; and those of us who are dependent upon the proceeds from the sale of cotton have all worked earnestly to bring about a satisfactory bill on this subject. We have agreed on it; it has passed the House; it has passed the Senate; and it is the universal opinion that it may be the beginning of the break in the deadlock of the commodity-price depression.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I desire to ask the Senator from South Carolina if the bill as it comes back from the House prohibits the Government from making any future purchases of cotton?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, under the present set-up this bill provides that all the cotton the Government has shall be disposed of to the farmers who may take the options. What the Government may do under the law I am not advised or what else Congress may do I am not advised, but I want to state to the Senator here and now that one of the depressing influences on the cotton market for the last three years has been the holding of this Government cotton without the trade knowing when and where and how it would be disposed of. It was for that reason that I drafted this bill, hoping that we might dispose of such cotton in such manner as to be of benefit to the growers by giving them a stake in it and also relieving the Government of its holdings.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senator quite understood my question. As I understand from his statement, however, the bill, as it comes from the House, does require the Government to dispose of all its cotton by a certain date in 1935?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I think that is desirable. The point I was inquiring about is this: Can the Government, under this measure as it comes back from the House, make additional purchases of cotton on the market?

Mr. SMITH. It can not purchase an additional bale.

Mr. GORE. That was the point I had in mind, and that was my first question. I think the Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. SMITH. The Government can not purchase an additional bale. It is restricted entirely to the disposition of the cotton it now has; that is all.

Mr. GORE. I thought—from the statement I understood the Senator to make in conversation with him—that that was the point, and I desired that point to go into the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH. It is in the RECORD. There is no such intimation in the bill, and there is no possibility of the Government buying a bale outside. The bill simply provides for the disposition of the cotton it already has on hand.

Mr. GORE. The Government disposes of what it already has in hand by a fixed date, and makes no purchase in addition to that?

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. That relieves my mind on those points, and, while I still do not favor the bill, it greatly diminishes my objection to it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in order that all may learn of the material changes made by the House, I again request that the bill be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment from the House of Representatives in the bill passed by the Senate.

The amendment of the House of Representatives was again read.

PROPOSED OCEAN MAIL CONTRACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 375) submitted by Mr. BLACK on February 27, 1933, requesting the Postmaster General to postpone the awarding of a contract for ocean mail service from Philadelphia-Baltimore to Liverpool-Manchester.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 12.30 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement a vote is to be had upon the resolution offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I desire to withdraw a part of the resolution, and offer an amendment to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can modify his resolution.

Mr. BLACK. Beginning on line 9 of the preamble with the words "which were recently purchased from the Shipping Board," and going down to and through and including the second paragraph on the second page, ending with the words "is to be generally investigated by a committee of the Senate; and," I desire to withdraw that part of the preamble.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator modifies his resolution.

Mr. BLACK. Now, Mr. President, I desire to add, after the word "investigated" on line 3 of the resolution, the words "by the Senate."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator further modifies his resolution.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Alabama if he will also omit the last "whereas" before the resolution?

Mr. BLACK. I do not desire to omit the last "whereas," because it is based on a report that I have on my desk.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I do not think the Senate has before it any—

The VICE PRESIDENT. No debate is in order. The Senate is to vote on the resolution at half-past 12. The Senator may offer an amendment.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, my thought about the matter is that this resolution ought not to contain, in its preamble, any matter which is not—

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is not in order. The Senator can offer an amendment.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well. I move to amend the resolution by striking out the last of the "whereases."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That motion will not be in order until after the original resolution is voted upon. The preamble must be voted on after the resolution is acted upon.

The question is upon agreeing to the resolution, as modified.

Mr. BLACK. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOGAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who is absent. I do not know how he would vote. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HULL]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. PATTERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is unavoidably absent from the Chamber.

Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If I felt free to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SHORTRIDGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. Not knowing how he would vote, I am not at liberty to vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McKELLAR (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. STEPHENS. I am paired with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON]; but I am assured that he would vote as I shall vote upon this question, and therefore I am free to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. HASTINGS. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] on business of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. My colleague [Mr. HOWELL] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]; and

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] are detained from the Senate in a committee meeting.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—45

Bankhead	Caraway	Hayden	Sheppard
Barkley	Clark	Johnson	Smith
Black	Connally	Kendrick	Stephens
Blaine	Coolidge	King	Swanson
Borah	Costigan	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Dill	McGill	Trammell
Brookhart	Fletcher	McKellar	Tydings
Broussard	Frazier	Neely	Walsh, Mass.
Bulky	George	Nye	Wheeler
Bulow	Glass	Pittman	
Byrnes	Gore	Robinson, Ark.	
Capper	Harrison	Russell	

NAYS—28

Austin	Dickinson	Hatfield	Schall
Bailey	Fess	Hebert	Schuyler
Barbour	Glenn	Keyes	Smoot
Bingham	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Stefwer
Carey	Grammer	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Copeland	Hale	Oddie	Walcott
Dale	Hastings	Reed	Watson

NOT VOTING—23

Ashurst	Kean	Norris	Townsend
Couzens	Lewis	Patterson	Vandenberg
Cutting	Logan	Reynolds	Wagner
Davis	Long	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Howell	McNary	Shipstead	White
Hull	Norbeck	Shortridge	

So Mr. BLACK's resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). The question now is on the preamble of the resolution, as modified.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order. The question is on agreeing to the preamble as modified.

The preamble, as modified, was agreed to.

The resolution and preamble, as modified and agreed to, are as follows:

Whereas specifications have been issued by the Postmaster General calling for bids on March 1 for an ocean mail contract from Philadelphia-Baltimore to Liverpool-Manchester, route No. 58 B, which involves the establishment of a new steamship service and the payment by the Government of about \$1,000,000 per annum for 10 years, or \$10,000,000 in mail money, and also involves the

selling of vessels by the United States Lines Co. for a reported price of \$500,000 each; and

Whereas the Merchant Fleet Corporation reported on February 6, 1933, that this steamship service is not justified: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be requested to postpone the awarding of the said mail contract until the matter can be more fully investigated by the Senate and the soundness of the proposition more completely determined from the standpoint of the Government's interest and all the facts and circumstances involved.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I desire to make a short statement in reference to the vote I have just cast.

As everyone knows, this steamship line, if put into effect, would run out of the port of Baltimore together with Philadelphia and Norfolk. I should like very much to see this line inaugurated. In normal times perhaps my vote might have been different; but with the depleted condition of the United States Treasury, with the Budget in its present state of \$4,000,000,000 unbalance, I feel that we should not duplicate services which are already being well cared for. The mail will go to England and to Europe from New York and from Baltimore and from Philadelphia as it has been going for these many years; and I do not feel that this new line, with its million-dollar-a-year charge upon the Federal Treasury, is a proper measure to be voted upon favorably at this time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it may be too late to take effective action. The deed may be done. The contract may be signed. An empty and exhausted Treasury may have been further exhausted upon the stroke of the clock at high noon. The Postmaster General may have cut through red-tape entanglements and accelerated the speed which ordinarily characterizes the business of the Government.

In any event, I desire to move that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to notify the President, the Postmaster General, and the Shipping Board at once of the action just taken on this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON OPEN-MARKET TRADING IN GRAIN FUTURES ON CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, on yesterday I submitted a resolution, Senate Resolution 376, which went over under the rule, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] having objected to its consideration and said he would take it up to-day. He informs me now that he has no objection to the resolution. It is a resolution calling upon the Agricultural Department for certain information.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. This is a mere resolution of inquiry?

Mr. WHEELER. A resolution of inquiry, that is all; and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] tells me that he has no objection to it. It only asks for information from the department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 376) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas it is desirable to get the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture as to whether or not the 500,000 bushels limitation required to be reported upon by operators on boards of trade should be fixed by law or allowed to be made variable by orders of the Secretary; and

Whereas on October 24, 1932, there was lifted and suspended the restrictions on open-market trading in grain futures on the Chicago Board of Trade by order of the Secretary of Agriculture; and

Whereas these restrictions upon short selling in 1927 for a short time were suspended; and

Whereas prices after both such suspensions declined to the advantage of the speculative short seller and to the disadvantage of producers; and

Whereas the decline in prices, following the order of the Secretary of Agriculture on October 24, 1932, reached lower levels than had theretofore ever been recorded: Be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to ascertain the facts and report to the Senate, giving full and complete answer to the following questions and such others as may occur to him as being pertinent to this matter:

(1) What was the purpose of suspending on October 24, 1932, the reports from board of trade members required pursuant to the grain futures act of the accounts of speculators and short sellers?

(2) Were these reports suspended on recommendation of the present chief of the grain futures department, or were they suspended on request of members of the Chicago Board of Trade or other exchanges? If the latter, who were these parties and what was their position in the market at that time? Were they long or short? If short, did they buy in at a profit when prices later sold down?

(3) What was the effect upon wheat prices of the suspension of the restrictions? What was the position in the market of those affected by the suspension, at the time and just prior to suspension? What has been their position since?

(4) To what extent have big speculators been active in wheat futures transactions during the drastic price declines of the past two or three years? Have they been dealing on the long or the short side of the market, and to what extent?

Resolved further, That the Secretary of Agriculture in such report shall make a full disclosure of the names and addresses of all persons and firms that have held a speculative short position in wheat futures on the Chicago Board of Trade equal to or in excess of 1,000,000 bushels at any time during the past two or three years, while prices have suffered unprecedented declines, and shall indicate which of these, if any, were also found on the short side of the market during that period in 1927 when the restrictions were lifted the first time.

The preamble was agreed to.

PURCHASE AND SALE OF COTTON BY THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. KING obtained the floor.

Mr. BRATTON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRATTON. What is the motion of the Senator from Oregon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon moves to concur in the House amendment to Senate bill No. 5122, and the Senator from Utah has the floor.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina stated, if I understood him correctly, that there was no objection to the House bill now before us. I have before me the record of the proceedings of the House of Representatives of yesterday, and I discover that 183 Members of the House voted against the bill and only 188 voted for it. There was some sharp debate, evidencing opposition to the policies which are imbedded in this bill and to substantially all of its provisions.

Mr. President, I associate myself with the able Representatives who, in the debate yesterday, excoriated this bill, showed its unsatisfactory provisions, and the maze of difficulty and confusion into which we would plunge the Government and the cotton industry by its passage.

In the bill just read—and I shall refer in a moment to some of the statements made by two or three of the Representatives—I discovered that there had been eliminated in the House section 2 of the Senate bill, which, upon motion of the Senator from Tennessee, was incorporated in the measure. I shall refer to that in a moment.

The bill as it passed the House also contains the words, "and directed" which had been stricken from the bill in the Senate, so that now the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is not only authorized to lend money for this fantastic, unsound, and speculative scheme and adventure, but it is directed to lend money to this new board created by the bill which is to take the place of the Farm Board, the stabilization organization, and the A. C. C. A. organization—these pyramided organizations which have been created and organized directly or indirectly by Congress. This language seeks to compel the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan its funds to the new board to be set up under this bill.

The bill transfers some of the duties of the Farm Board, and the Stabilization Corporation, and the A. C. C. A., to which I have referred, to another Federal board, which is given extensive powers, including the right to borrow money ad libitum from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. President, there is something inexplicable, something which seems to me unfair and unjust, in inserting provisions which the Senate had stricken from the bill for the protec-

tion of the Treasury, and putting into the bill, as the House did, a provision compelling the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend, we do not know how much money, millions, perhaps tens of millions, of dollars to another Federal board with authority, in some respects, greater and more dangerous than that given to the Farm Board.

My information is that there are two and three million bales of cotton which will come under the control of this board, and upon which there are to-day liens and obligations aggregating tens of millions of dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have been looking at the Record, but I have been looking at it very casually and hastily. Is it a fact that yesterday in the House an amendment was attached to the bill by which it would become obligatory upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend this money?

Mr. KING. I would like to look at the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. I observe on page 5269 of the Record, for instance, an amendment that was presented, as follows: "The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed." Is that the amendment to which the Senator refers?

Mr. KING. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. It reads:

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to advance money and to make loans to the board in such amounts and upon such terms as may be agreed upon by the board and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with such warehouse receipts as collateral security.

May I inquire of the Senator whether there is any other collateral that is taken by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation save the warehouse certificates?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator is an able lawyer, and if I understand him, he interprets the language as requiring the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans in unlimited amounts to the new Federal board, with which it may discharge the millions of dollars of liens upon the cotton purchased by the Farm Board, the Stabilization Corporation, and the American Cotton Cooperative Association and obtain title to the same; and that such loans must be made upon no security or collateral other than warehouse receipts.

The Senate bill authorized loans to the new board by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but it left that organization full power to determine whether loans should be made, and if so, the terms upon which they should be made. It did not "direct" loans to be made, nor did it attempt to prescribe the security or collateral required on the loans to which the board should agree. I appreciate that all efforts to amend this bill will be unavailing. It has been predetermined that it shall pass, that the Senate bill shall be repudiated even in this body wherein it originated, and the unsound measure now before us shall be hurried to the President. It is to be hoped that it will fail to receive his signature.

As stated, there were attempts to incorporate in the Senate bill some few safeguards and to afford some modicum of protection to the Government. But such efforts are to be frustrated and the Government again to be projected into unsound schemes and enterprises which are, in my view, at variance with our theories of economics and government and in contravention of the rights of individuals and without constitutional warrant.

In my opinion, the plan embodied in the pending measure possesses many of the infirmities and evils of the so-called Farm Board act and embarks the Government upon an unsafe and turbulent sea of perilous experimentation. All precepts to which we have given heed, all theories of government to which we have averred attachment, all constitutional axioms and practices are discarded and ignored in the bill which this body will soon crown with its benediction.

This bill is founded upon the theory that private initiative is at an end, that the rightful authority of citizens to govern themselves and manage their own affairs is inadequate in this age, that all of the political and economic

views upon which we and our fathers have relied are no longer to be followed. Paternalism, or Socialism, or both, are to supplant the democratic policies and philosophy upon which our country has advanced to the highest station among the nations of the earth.

Mr. Hoover's Farm Board was an assault upon our economic and political structure, and has created demoralization, not alone in the fields of agriculture but in all departments of our economic and political life. It introduced unsound principles and dangerous economic and political policies, undermined the faith and confidence of many of the people in a proper individualism and in the duties and functions of States and local governments, and reversed the political philosophy upon which our institutions rest.

This bill goes far beyond the Farm Board act, in Federal usurpations and devitalizing paternalism. The Federal Government is to engage in the cotton business upon a stupendous scale. It is to use the moneys taken from the people by taxation or borrowed from them upon its issued securities to purchase several million bales of cotton. It is to discharge liens and obligations upon these cotton reserves; it is acquiring the legal title to the same by the expenditure of tens of millions of dollars; it is to sell the cotton as and when its officials determine, fixing the prices for the same, as well as the terms upon which sales are to be made.

The general board can destroy the cotton market or unsettle cotton prices and cause such violent fluctuations as to destroy all private activities in the buying and selling of this product. It can affect the prices of all cotton textiles and all commodities into which cotton enters. It can use the power given it by this bill to coerce or cajole farmers to limit cotton production, as well as production of agricultural commodities that enter into the agricultural markets.

Under this bill speculation and gambling in cotton are not only possible but inevitable.

If it had been suggested a few decades ago that the National Government exercise the authority granted by this bill it would have aroused fierce opposition.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES. What the Senator from California inquired was as to whether or not the Reconstruction Finance Corporation secured as collateral for such a loan anything other than the warehouse receipts for cotton.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is exactly what I was inquiring.

Mr. BYRNES. I so understood the Senator. The language of the bill as it now stands provides that such warehouse receipts shall be accepted as collateral security, but authorizes the board to reach a determination as to the terms under which those loans can be made. For instance, a warehouse receipt for cotton may be based upon a price of 6 cents a pound, and a bale of cotton would be worth \$30. Terms would be arrived at as to the loan to be made upon such warehouse receipt. That is what the bill for which my colleague is responsible provides.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am seeking information, and I would like to inquire whether the Senator from South Carolina reached the construction he has just suggested by virtue of the amendment that is found on page 5269 and which was yesterday adopted by the House?

Mr. BYRNES. I am referring to the bill only as it is written, with the language which authorizes and directs the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance money and to make loans to the board in such amounts and upon such terms as may be agreed upon by the board and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. That was the intent of it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will yield further, that is exactly what the board is authorized and directed to do, so far as security may be concerned. But I will ask the Senator from South Carolina to follow the last clause, "with such warehouse receipts as collateral security." That is, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is

authorized and directed to make loans upon such terms as may be agreed upon by the board and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, "with such warehouse receipts as collateral security."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I explain the matter to the Senator?

Mr. JOHNSON. I would be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. That is a custom which has been universal, even before we had the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It means this, that they will take the warehouse receipts, and will agree with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as to what proportion of the value of the cotton they will advance and yet be perfectly safe. In other words, if the cotton is worth \$30 a bale, they are justified, if they so agree, to advance within 1 or 2 cents a pound of its market value. That is all it means, and every cotton man knows that that is universally done. That is all it would do.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it is obvious that there is some difference of opinion as to the meaning of this new provision, and I think the questions propounded by the Senator from California should be seriously considered. The average reader, or judge, in the construction of the language of this section, would say that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was limited in the collateral which it was to exact for making a loan to the taking of the warehouse receipt.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. In a moment. If it had been intended that the board might require collateral in addition to the warehouse receipts, why did not those who drafted the provision, add words, clearly stating that in addition to warehouse receipts, other collateral might be required?

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me a moment, I think we may dispose of this as a practical proposition. The board would have no other assets except the cotton it bought. It could offer nothing but the cotton.

Mr. KING. It will have its notes, its credits, whatever it has, little or much.

Mr. GEORGE. It is not authorized to borrow a penny except to take over this cotton. It has no assets except the cotton. It would have no collateral to offer except the cotton. The language very clearly shows that the cotton is to be the only thing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is to make a loan on. But even if the language did not carry that very clear implication, the cotton board would have neither the power to borrow except to buy cotton, nor security to offer except the cotton actually purchased.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator assume that it will make no profits upon some of the sales, and that such profits, which might consist of notes or personal property or other collateral, might not be utilized?

Mr. GEORGE. It is not contemplated that they would make a profit. It is simply for the purpose of disposing of two lots of cotton. It is limited entirely to two already accumulated by the Government and on which the Government has already advanced the full market value of the cotton. While the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans, the money will go directly into the other pocket of the Government, that is, into another agency.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator if the Hanover Bank and many other banks have not made extensive loans to the A. C. C. A. upon this cotton, loans aggregating tens of millions of dollars, in addition to the loans which the Government has made to the stabilization corporation and the A. C. C. A., all of which practically have been lost?

Mr. GEORGE. The A. C. C. A. has lost money. The Farm Board has lost money. That is lost beyond all recovery. What they have, so far as this matter is concerned, is a certain lot of cotton which is worth its market value and no more than its market value. I think, although I do not make the statement positively, that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has already financed the cotton in the

hands of this particular Government agency, perhaps not in full, but certainly in large measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me call attention to the fact that this is putting the cotton already owned by the Government in the hands of a commission for the purpose of making smaller the next year's yield of cotton. The Government has this cotton and owns it. By utilizing it in the way pointed out the board will make a contract with the planters of cotton by which they will reduce the amount of cotton raised next year.

Everybody admits that the cotton owned now has an unhappy effect on the price. It depresses the price all the time. It injures the cotton farmer in that way. By properly managing the surplus which the Government now owns, as it will go into the hands of this board, it can be utilized for making contracts for the present year with the producers of cotton, which will minimize or reduce the yield of cotton this next year and therefore help the cotton farmer—or at least not hurt him. He will be allowed to buy the cotton already in his district as cheaply as he could raise it to save his life. He will be permitted to raise other crops, feed crops and so forth, and he will be greatly benefited. We all realize that the farmers are in a bad fix and especially the cotton farmers. We must get the bill through now if it is to have any effect on the ensuing crop, the crop that is being put in the ground now in some of the far South territory. We are very anxious to get it done.

Mr. KING. Let me ask the Senator, in view of the statement just made that this would take land out of cultivation, whether the Senator is accurate? As I heard the bill read, and I have had no opportunity to analyze it because it has been brought here without an opportunity for us to examine it, I interpret it as providing that lands which have heretofore been producing cotton, if withdrawn under the terms of the bill, could not be used for nationally produced agricultural commodities for sale directly or indirectly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Like wheat or corn, for instance. Yes; we do not want to interfere with those commodities. Under the bill there is no reason in the world why the farmers can not raise more hay, more vegetable crops, more small grains of every kind. There is no reason why they should not do it and I have no doubt they will. They will raise things to be consumed on the farm that will give them a better living at home while, by means of limiting the cotton crop, they will get a better price for their chief money crop, which is cotton.

Mr. KING. Then if I understand the Senator we are to use the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the power of the Government to force contracts—perhaps that is too strong a term—to obtain contracts from the farmers under the terms of which, in order to get the benefits of this bill and of money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through the power of the Federal Government, they must enter into agreements not only to not grow cotton upon land which they own, but that they will not grow any other agricultural crops that might be for sale directly or indirectly in the markets of nationally produced agricultural products.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it does not go that far. For instance, they could not use the land to greatly increase the wheat crop.

Mr. KING. Why not?

Mr. McKELLAR. There are several reasons for that, but the principal and best reason is that we can not produce wheat profitably on cotton land even in good times.

Mr. KING. The Senator now concedes that a producer of cotton could not raise wheat if he were to enter into a contract under the provisions of this bill; so it comes down to this, that we are requiring farmers who have produced cotton to agree, first, in order to get the benefit of the act, to grow no more cotton during the period prescribed, upon lands upon which cotton has been produced; and, secondly,

they may not raise any agricultural products for sale, directly or indirectly, in the markets of nationally produced agricultural products. As the Senator said, they may not produce wheat and may not of course produce corn. There are many other agricultural commodities which find markets nationally and internationally, and they may not produce crops of that character upon their lands. They must, as the Senator said, produce only those things which they consume upon the farm, garden vegetables and so forth, that would not enter into competition with nationally produced agricultural commodities.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. Is the Senator objecting because he is interested in the cotton farmer, or is he objecting because he says the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would not proceed to fix the security, or is he objecting because he believes it would increase the production of wheat and do injury to the wheat farmer?

Mr. KING. I am objecting to the whole scheme contemplated by this bill for some of the reasons I have imperfectly stated.

Mr. BYRNES. Just on general principles?

Mr. KING. I am objecting because I think it an unwise, unsound, and speculative venture; that it is inconsistent with our political institutions and our economic policies; that it will strengthen paternalism and contribute to the development of highly objectionable and dangerous socialistic policies.

Mr. BYRNES. First, as to the warehouse receipts, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation now can lend money to banks upon the collateral security of such banks and under the Federal reserve law.

Mr. KING. It can if it wants to do so.

Mr. BYRNES. It has the authority to do so.

Mr. KING. But it is not compelled to do so.

Mr. BYRNES. No; but it will accept warehouse receipts for cotton notes if such warehouse receipts have been pledged as security for the notes.

As to the other objection, that it would require cotton farmers to make the contract, no representative from a cotton State is objecting to it.

As to the third statement that it might cause the growing of wheat, under the language of the bill, the farmer may not produce any nationally produced crop except for his own consumption. He can not produce it for sale.

So I think all three objections thus far stated by the Senator are really answered by the provisions of the bill.

Mr. KING. The failure of a call on States to protest against this measure does not prove that it is wise or should be enacted into law. Many persons have not opposed unsound policies or measures, either from a failure to fully comprehend their significance or inherent dangers or by reason of indifference, or from supposed benefits that might be derived.

The junior Senator from South Carolina and his colleague [Mr. SMITH] are adepts at legislation and language. They are persuasive on the floor and in private conversation. But I am not persuaded to follow them in support of this bill. But my objection to the bill is fundamental. I think it projects the Government into speculation into the cotton business with all its problems and uncertainties, into agricultural activities, to a degree wholly inconsistent with the functions and authority of the Federal Government and which is not only a bad precedent, but in the end will injuriously, if not disastrously, affect the cotton market and the farmers themselves.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the senior Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is thoroughly aware that unfortunately the Government is already in the cotton business and we are trying to get it out. The Government has

the cotton. That cotton has a depressing influence on the market. Nobody knows how or when or where it may be disposed of. Were the Government to attempt right now to put the 3,000,000 bales of cotton on the market, it would depress it far below the distressing price at the present time.

Let us go a step further. If the Government does not dispose of it under the terms of this bill, it must hold it. It has the cotton. If another crop is made approximating a normal crop, it stands to lose still further 2 or 3 cents a pound, or perhaps \$30,000,000 additional.

Mr. KING. The Senator is making a speech in my time, but I consent.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator does not object to getting the light, and I am trying to show him the light.

Mr. KING. Very well; proceed, as I am always desirous of obtaining light.

Mr. SMITH. Here is the Government with 3,000,000 bales of cotton. If it does not dispose of it, under the terms of the bill it must dispose of it with possibly a normal crop coming on to add to that tremendous surplus. Under the terms of the bill we say we will take out of the surplus the 3,000,000 bales of cotton and distribute it amongst the farmers in lieu of that much production. Therefore we will have 3,000,000 bales out of the surplus, 3,000,000 bales curtailed out of production, and the Government out of the business, the farmer having a stake in cotton which under depressed conditions he has not disposed of, thereby relieving the situation from both ends, both as to surplus, because we take 3,000,000 bales out of the surplus, and as to production, because we take 3,000,000 bales out of production.

If the Senator does not think that this is going to get the Government out of the cotton business and put it back in the hands of the cotton farmers and then provide for its distribution when the cotton year comes on in October, 1933, then I am afraid he does not understand the purposes of the bill. We hope that the application of the bill will inevitably be that the farmers will dispose of their cotton—not the board, but the farmers. The farmers have an option that they have gained by virtue of signing a contract that they will not produce cotton on cotton land.

The wheat people came in and said, "You will plant that land in wheat." We said, "All right; we will provide that the land can not be planted in anything that will come in competition with that which you are producing."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I add just a word to what the Senator from South Carolina has said? I invite the attention of the Senator from Utah to section 7 of the bill, which provides:

The board shall sell the cotton held by it at its discretion: *Provided*, That it shall dispose of all cotton held by it by March 1, 1935.

In other words, it provides for disposition of the surplus cotton now in the hands of the Government, and I believe it is the best way that has been suggested by anyone for the Government to get out of the cotton business.

Mr. KING. Let me ask the Senator why the House struck out the provision which called for the sale of the cotton before August 15, 1933, and extended the period to January 1, 1934?

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say to the Senator that I much prefer the provisions of the Senate bill to those of the bill as it passed the House, but time is the essence of the existing situation. If this matter is postponed until the next session of Congress it will be impossible to carry it out this year. It is of the most intense importance that the bill, if it is passed at all, should be passed at this session of Congress. Therefore I am willing to accept the terms of the bill as it passed the House, not because I believe it is better than the Senate bill, but because it is necessary to get the measure through immediately. I do not believe the House bill is hedged about in the way I would like to see it done.

Two amendments which I offered were left out and the amendment of the Senator from Utah, which was a good amendment, was also left out. I should be very happy to

have these amendments inserted at a later date, but planting time is upon the growers in southern Texas, and in southern Florida, and unless we get this bill through we shall lose the entire good effect of the proposed legislation for this year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it would seem that I should yield to the eloquent, fervent appeals of the three able Senators who are pleading for this bill, particularly when I sit in such close proximity to them. Their presence is overaweing, their eloquence persuasive; and nevertheless, my power of resistance still exists; I am opposed to the bill and shall vote against it. Notwithstanding my regard for the Senators and my knowledge that they sincerely believe that this proposed legislation will be productive of good, I can not share the optimistic views they express. We have so often of late followed policies foreign to our traditions and practices and beliefs—so at variance with our theories of government and its relation to individuals and private business—that in this period of depression we seem to lose our balance and wander into devious and dangerous paths. The hope of some temporary relief, through some expedient or experiment, allures us from the safe but perhaps hard and rugged road. In my opinion this bill tends to perpetuate evils which have grown up under the Federal Farm Board, under its maladministration and unwise policies.

This scheme projects the Government again into the buying and selling of agricultural commodities; it sets up another Farm Board without some of the powers which the present board possesses but without limitation upon the drafts which the new board may make upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There is no limitation. It may be millions, it may be tens of millions that may be required in order to release this cotton from the liens and mortgages and other obligations to which it must respond.

One would think, Mr. President, that we had had enough experience of the Government engaging in activities of this character. One would suppose, with the wrecks caused by the Farm Board, its maladministration, and the evil and calamitous consequences of its activities, that we would not care to embark upon another enterprise which promises disaster.

Mr. President, I return to the point I was discussing when the Senators projected themselves into the debate and presented their views in favor of this measure. I make no criticism of them, of course, and regret that I find myself so much opposed to the views of Senators for whom I entertain high regard. But, believing the bill to be unwise, I regard it as my duty to enter my protest against its enactment into law.

As I have said, I have no expectation of defeating the bill. There are forces in its favor which will overcome all opposition in this body. I understand that many northern cotton users, not improperly, are associating themselves in the movement to secure the passage of this bill, and a combination between the New England States and some cotton States is one which it is difficult to defeat. I think that both the cotton-mill men and the cotton producers are making a serious mistake in backing this bill.

It may be that the textile-mill operators hope to secure the cotton cheaper under this plan than if they had to go out on to the market and buy it; that if they can make some sort of a composition or reach an understanding with the Federal board to be created, they may expect to obtain their cotton at prices below market prices; but as to that I shall not speculate. At any rate, there is, as I understand, a sort of fellow feeling, an association—and not improperly—between the interests to which I have referred, the millmen and some cotton producers, and they are seeking the passage of this bill.

I return now, Mr. President, to the question, Why did the other House insert a provision that will be construed as compulsory and require the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan the millions and tens of millions of dollars that may be required to release this cotton from the liens and the obligations now imposed upon it? Why did they not leave it as other persons who are seeking credit from the

Reconstruction Finance Corporation are left, to make terms and to obtain, if they can, from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation upon business lines credit, instead of compelling the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to open up the Treasury of the United States and to make loans whether they will or not?

If this organization shall come with warehouse receipts, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as the bill undoubtedly is to be interpreted, will be compelled to extend credit without any limitation upon the amount which may be demanded. I object to that provision; and, in view of the fact, Mr. President, that the Senate considered the subject and heard the statement of the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Connecticut in opposition to the words "and directed," as well as subsequent observations which were made, I find no reason for the Senate's position to be repudiated other than that proper and adequate security that would satisfy reasonably prudent trustees of the Government, the directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, can not be offered, and therefore it was deemed best to require the trustees, against their will perhaps, to extend credit to the new organization which we are creating by this bill.

I protest against this amendment. It is unwise; it is unjust to the Government; it is unfair to the taxpayers of the United States. If another measure were to be introduced which directed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan to everybody or to anybody or to any organization, railroad or bank, there would be a loud protest here. It would be said that it was unwise and unsound legislation.

The Senator from Tennessee offered an amendment when the bill was before this body providing that the cotton should be sold before August 15 of this year. That period has now been extended. Why? Was it in order to give additional time for speculation? Of course it will be said it is for the purpose of in some way preserving a reasonable market; but, Mr. President, we will have upon our hands for this long period of time several million bales of cotton to disturb the market, to depress prices, and to hang as a sword of Damocles, so to speak, over the entire textile industry of the United States which depends upon cotton.

That has been one of the evils of the Farm Board and of the Stabilization Corporation. The Farm Board went into the market and speculated in cotton; it speculated in wheat; it tried to get a corner upon cotton and upon wheat; it tried to peg prices, and the result was that the Government lost more than \$300,000,000 in the wild orgy of speculation and in other unsound and wholly indefensible practices. Yet, with that experience before us, we propose to create another organization to engage in speculation—for that is what this means—and, more than speculation, to coerce the farmers to accept certain terms, for instance, not to use their own land as they see fit, not only not to grow cotton but to refrain from growing any other agricultural commodity that may come into competition with the agricultural commodities of other portions of the United States. As I have said, this plan is unsound and indefensible upon principles of recognized economics or accepted views as to the functions of the Federal Government.

I said a moment ago in reply to the statement of the Senator from South Carolina, that everybody had assented to this bill, that in the House of Representatives it was passed by a majority of 5 votes. I want to show, Mr. President, that some of the strong men of that body pointed out some of the evils of this measure. I read a few sentences from the remarks of Representative HART, of Michigan, a courageous and able exponent of sound economic principles as they apply to agriculture and to business generally. He stated:

We on the Democratic side went out in the last campaign in the Middle West and sunk them—

Referring to the Republicans—

because they were speculating in farm products, but yet we bring before this House a more vicious measure for speculation than was ever contained in the farm marketing act.

Let us see what our candidate for President, the new President, who won upon that issue in the West, said about it. I am reading from the Democratic Campaign Textbook and quoting from Mr. Roosevelt's speech immediately after he landed from that airplane in Chicago and reached the platform:

"We should repeal immediately those provisions of law that compel the Federal Government to go into the market to purchase, to sell, to speculate in farm products."

We not only have not repealed those provisions but we are now supplementing that organization by another, and drawing upon the Treasury of the United States, and compelling the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to dip into it and take out money for speculative purposes, and to take it out without limitation.

Now, we bring a bill upon this floor which provides for direct speculation in cotton. We not only provide for putting the Government into speculating in cotton but we bribe and invite each individual cotton farmer to join with us. We ask him to come in and gamble with us in the cotton market. We say to him, "If you will cut down your acreage, while your son raises his, or while he obtains some one else who will go out and raise more cotton, we will give you a certain percentage of this cotton upon which you may speculate, and if you lose we will pay the loss."

This bill invites gambling and speculation; and, as usual, the Government of the United States stands at the crossroads to pay all the losses. We are not very consistent, Mr. President. We are not following Democratic principles as to the functions of government and the limitations imposed upon it; nor are we in harmony with the Democratic platform or with the declarations of our candidate for the Presidency, who will soon enter the White House.

Now, that is what this bill does. This bill is also sponsored by the American Cotton Cooperatives.

He ought to have said "one cooperative," the American Cotton Cooperative Association, this Creekmore corporation; this organization which has contributed to the payment of Mr. Creekmore \$75,000 a year salary or compensation, which he controls and which he desires to perpetuate; and this organization, which is dominated by him, is demanding that it shall not surrender any of these profits illegitimately obtained in speculation at the expense of the Government, instead of turning them over to the Farm Board to reduce pro tanto the claim which the board has against the American Cotton Cooperative Association and the Stabilization Corporation for the more than \$150,000,000 which legally and equitably it has against them.

They claim that they were stabilizing when they lost \$60,000,000 of the Government's money.

It is more than \$60,000,000, may I say—\$20,000,000 first appropriated to pay the defunct, bankrupt cotton cooperatives of the South, 11 out of the 13, as I now recall, having become bankrupt. The Farm Board paid their debts to the extent of twenty millions. Then \$63,000,000 were lost, and then ninety millions were lost, through the speculations and folly of the Stabilization Corporation under the direction of the Farm Board in cooperation with the A. C. C. A.

Yet we come in here and agree to take this cotton off their hands on a deal. We do not fix the market price. We say they may come in and deal with us. When the Government gets through with that dealing proposition, you will find this American Cotton Cooperative has segregated some millions of dollars, which they will take back into the market and speculate with and lose again.

He was interrupted by Mr. BANKHEAD:

Will the gentleman yield?

And after having yielded, Mr. BANKHEAD propounded this question:

Can the gentleman point out where the adoption of this resolution would increase the loss in cotton already suffered by the Government?

Mr. HART. Nobody can point out whether we will increase or decrease the loss, because you are going into a speculative deal. You can not go into any commodity market unless you are speculating. There is no certainty about these markets. That has been the wrong assumption. That was the assumption of the Federal Farm Board—that they could stabilize; that they could orderly market and carry on the business different than the ordinary individual would. Now they say we will lose some money if we do not carry out this plan.

I say to you that within 30 days I can produce independent dealers in this country who will take this cotton off the market; take it off the hands of the cooperatives and pay the market price for it; men who know what they are doing with it; not a lot of politicians and propagandists who have been handling this deal, but substantial cotton merchants who have been marketing cotton throughout the world for generations; not those who have made their money out of the Federal Treasury, but men with ability to judge the markets; men who know the quality of cotton; men who have built up their trade throughout the world. They will take that cotton off your hands at the market price, and the market will immediately rebound, because the world will have confidence in the men who buy it. To-day you are talking about reestablishing confidence in this country. You will never reestablish confidence by putting Government millions into speculation.

Mr. President, those are caustic and critical words, but I am inclined to think they are within the field of facts.

Mr. President, I ask leave to insert as a part of my remarks excerpts from addresses by Representatives STAFFORD and HOPE yesterday in the House on this measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is the most gigantic gambling proposition that has ever been proposed to the Congress.

Instead of the American Cooperative Cotton Association doing the gambling that cost the Government \$53,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States in their attempt to boost and hold the price of cotton for the 1929-30 crop and the 1930-31 crop, you are transferring that exploded proposition to a new board.

If I had not served on the special committee to investigate Government competition with private business and listened attentively to Mr. Creekmore, that \$75,000 beauty who is vice president of the American Cooperative Cotton Association, I would not be presumptuous enough to take time at this moment to discuss this bill; but this bill is for the relief of the American Cooperative Cotton Association that in 1929-30 purchased 1,300,000 bales of cotton and of the 1930-31 crop purchased 1,770,000 bales which it now has in its possession, and paid to the farmers 90 per cent of the market price when the price was 15 cents. To-day they are holding the bag.

With loans from the Farm Loan Board of tens of millions of dollars and with loans from the banks of \$10,000,000, this bill is for the direct relief of the Hanover Bank, for the relief of the Chase National Bank, for the relief of the other New York banks from which this cooperative association has obtained loans. You want the Treasury to come to the relief of the banks. You want the Treasury to come to the relief of the American Cooperative Association that to-day has over 3,000,000 bales of cotton hypothecated to secure these extravagant loans, and have the National Government hold the bag. Where is your consistency, except this consistency in wholesale plundering of the Treasury?

In 1929 and 1930 there was a surplus of 9,000,000 bales; in 1930 and 1931 there was a surplus of 10,000,000 bales; in 1931 and 1932 there was a surplus of 13,000,000 bales; and now you propose by this chimerical piece of economic legerdemain to attempt a curtailment of acreage of 30 per cent in an endeavor to stimulate the price.

Have you not received enough poison by reason of this artificial attempt against all laws of trade and against the laws of supply and demand in trying to artificially stimulate the price by the colossal failure of the Farm Board?

Why, even Mr. Creekmore had to admit that the law of supply and demand determines the price in the last analysis. Never before have I known such a gigantic proposal of sticking the hand into the Treasury for the benefit of private bankers, who have loaned millions to the American Cotton Cooperative Association, which is absolutely bankrupt. The Farm Board has loaned tens of millions to this association with a shoe-string capital of \$79,500, all in the fanatical endeavor to control prices in a falling market. Have you not had enough illustration of the futility of the Government attempting to bolster prices by withdrawing cotton from the market, when you can see from the figures I have given here and from the testimony which I have referred to and which I have here, that such a plan is unworkable?

In these times, of all times, we should be circumspect. When I reentered Congress four years ago I voted against the agricultural marketing act, because I had no faith in it and because it was counter to every sound economic principle. As I am leaving Congress, I am going to vote against this gigantic socialistic venture, which not only equals that in its stupidity but goes farther into the Treasury and which will entail another loss of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. Come out in the open and admit that this is stabilization. It is going to fail, just as your efforts failed and were bound to fail under the agricultural marketing act. [Applause.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, all the discussion that has taken place on this bill so far has been upon the assumption that this bill is going to make the cotton farmer rich, if we enact it. I do not read in this bill anything of the kind. As a matter of fact, this is not a new plan. If some of you remember what was known as the Walla Walla wheat

plan something like a year and a half ago, you will see that exactly the same plan is contemplated here. But the Walla Walla plan had more justification because of the fact that the Stabilization Corporation itself had the wheat on hand. It did not have to go and get it from the cooperatives, or the Red Cross, or from the Department of Agriculture. In order to put that plan in operation we did not have to start a new board. The Walla Walla plan was presented to the Farm Board and they turned it down because they thought it would not work, after their economists had given it the most careful study. I studied the Walla Walla plan at that time and I was not convinced it would work, and I frankly told the proponents of the plan that I thought the effect of the Walla Walla plan, if adopted, might be to actually increase wheat acreage. What is likely to happen in this case if you adopt this particular plan? I hold in my hand here a statement some one sent around to us this morning, I presume one of the proponents of the measure, though not signed by anyone, and in this statement it is asserted that unless we pass this bill the acreage of cotton will be increased by from 5 to 10 per cent, and attention is called to all of the capital that is available for cotton production this year. If, in view of the present low price of cotton, the acreage is going to be increased from 5 to 10 per cent, I submit that if you say to the farmers that there is going to be a reduction on the part of some farmers, other farmers will not go into the plan and will increase production.

You are not going to be able to make contracts with all of the cotton farmers; there is not enough cotton to go around. The result will be that you will have some who will cut down production and others who will increase it, and nobody will know until the end of the year what the result will be, whether an increase or a decrease. Besides, production is dependent on weather as well as acreage. In 1930 the production of cotton per acre was 147.7 pounds, and the very next year, 1931, it was 200 pounds per acre. So you could very easily, on account of weather conditions, have an actual increase in production, even assuming you have some acreage reduction as suggested in this bill.

What you are doing here is setting up another farm board, an organization to stabilize the price of cotton; an organization which has the power to take over cotton now held by the cotton cooperatives, and make a complete settlement with these cooperatives of the indebtedness which they now owe the Federal Government. The loss on these loans to-day is about \$53,000,000. If you pass this bill, you are giving this board authority to go in and make settlement with these cotton cooperatives without any further investigation on the part of this Congress as to how that indebtedness was incurred, whether such a settlement ought to be made, or whether the cotton cooperatives have other property which could be taken over in payment of this indebtedness to the Government of the United States.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, since coming into the Chamber I have received a communication from a prominent resident of the South who has just obtained a copy of this bill as it passed the House; and in this communication he says:

I have just read the Smith cotton bill as amended by the House Agricultural Committee and reported to the House.

It passed the House, may I say, as it was reported.

The House committee removed all the safeguards and made the measure vicious in an important way. Were the House measure to prevail, the A. C. C. A. could keep all its assets and be relieved, at taxpayers' expense, of all its obligations.

Under the House measure there would be a new brand of uncertainty, trade fear, and concern, and in all likelihood American cotton would further decline in value.

The bill as passed by the Senate, if amended to include provision for a definite and known selling policy—say sales in lots not exceeding 500 bales, so as to attract many buyers, and in monthly quantities not exceeding 100,000 bales so as not to glut the market—would, I feel, bring about new confidence and a better market.

But if finally adopted as the House has amended it, it would simply wreck all that remains of constructive marketing facilities.

But, Mr. President, as I have indicated, appeals of that character fell upon deaf ears in the House, and the bill which eliminated the safeguards provided in the Senate bill passed, but with a majority of only five.

Mr. President, as the bill is before us, it provides that this board can make any character of settlement it desires with the American Cotton Cooperative Association. I have before me some data showing the speculative activities of that association; that it would go and buy and sell, and sell and buy, in order to make a profit, and when losses occurred it would charge them to the Stabilization Corporation and load them upon the Farm Board, or, when there were profits, they would be put on a shelf by themselves, to be appropriated by Mr. Creekmore and the organization with which he is affiliated. They want now to keep those profits, no one knows how much—four, five, six, or ten millions; I have heard various amounts—they want to keep those profits,

though the A. C. C. A., through its manipulations and activities, contributed to the loss of more than \$150,000,000 through the activities of the Farm Board and its subsidiaries in buying and selling cotton in the United States, first \$20,000,000, then \$63,000,000, then \$90,000,000, and we do not know what accumulating losses have occurred since those figures were submitted.

Mr. Creekmore's A. C. C. A. is a paper organization. It is not a cooperative. It is a corporation for speculation. Farmers do not own it. It is owned by a coterie that have derived profits from its operations. I have before me two volumes of the testimony taken by the Shannon committee in which the activities of Mr. Creekmore's organization are revealed. They show, in my judgment, a record that can not be defended.

Mr. Creekmore has been before various committees of the House and the Senate, admitting his compensation of \$75,000 a year; admitting, as is shown by the record and by the hearings before the committee of which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is the chairman, that other members of that organization were receiving ten, fifteen, and twenty thousand dollars a year. They want to maintain this A. C. C. A. They want to seize upon or hold whatever profits have been realized from their activities, though their activities have resulted in losses of tens of millions of dollars to the Treasury, instead of turning what assets they have back to the Farm Board, and receiving credit, of course, upon the obligations of the A. C. C. A. and the Stabilization Corporation to the Farm Board.

But for some reason some concern was manifested in behalf of the American Cotton Cooperative Association. The Senate was determined that it should disgorge any funds in its possession and unanimously decided that it should not retain any of the speculative profits which it now holds, but that it should be compelled to turn them back to the Farm Board. The House struck out this provision, and Mr. Creekmore and the American Cotton Cooperative Association are to retain the speculative profits in their possession.

Mr. President, this organization lost many millions in its wild speculations and passed the losses on to the Stabilization Corporation and the Farm Board.

Mr. President, I am disappointed in the action of the House. I feel sure that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is equally dissatisfied with its action. I feel sure that all Senators who have investigated this matter, the policies and principles involved, must regret the action of the House.

I have said all that I care to say. Nothing will avail. This bill is slated to go through, but I want to register my opposition to it. I protest against projecting the Government again into the buying and selling of commodities and speculating in the market. I protest against creating another board which will, I believe, involve our Government in further losses and in further complications and will be utterly ineffective in bringing relief and benefit to the cotton producers of the United States or to agriculture generally.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

LOANS IN PUERTO RICO BY THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I report back favorably from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 260) to validate an act of the fourth special session of the Twelfth Legislature of Puerto Rico entitled "An act authorizing the Governor of Puerto Rico to guarantee repayment, in the name of the people of Puerto Rico, of loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the agricultural credit corporations of the Island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes," approved October 21, 1932, and I submit a report (No. 1329) thereon.

Mr. President, this would authorize the Governor of Puerto Rico to guarantee the repayment, in the name of the people of Puerto Rico, of loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It was thought they had the right to pass this law. It is a wise and a just law. This joint resolution would merely validate the law they have passed. There is no objection to it; there is need for haste, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be reported for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas the fourth special session of the Twelfth Legislature of Puerto Rico passed an act entitled "An act authorizing the Governor of Puerto Rico to guarantee repayment, in the name of the people of Puerto Rico, of loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the agricultural credit corporations of the Island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes," approved by the Governor of Puerto Rico on October 21, 1932, and which reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. The Governor of Puerto Rico is hereby authorized and empowered to guarantee to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation created by the act of the Congress of the United States known as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act, in the name of the people of Puerto Rico, the repayment of loans made by said corporation under the provisions of said act, and amendments thereto, to the agricultural credit corporations organized in Puerto Rico.

"SEC. 2. The total sum of any guaranty or guaranties given by the Governor of Puerto Rico to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under the provisions of section 1 of this act shall not exceed \$500,000.

"SEC. 3. In acting in accordance with the authorization hereby conferred the Governor of Puerto Rico shall furnish the guaranties hereby authorized, in such form and under such terms as may be mutually agreed upon between him and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"SEC. 4. All laws or parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 5. It is hereby declared that an emergency exists requiring that this act shall take effect immediately, and it shall, therefore, take effect immediately after its approval by the governor."

And

Whereas counsel for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has held that this act is contrary to the organic act of Puerto Rico; and

Whereas it is convenient to the welfare of the agricultural interests of the island of Puerto Rico to permit the guaranty by the government of Puerto Rico of loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to agricultural credit corporations organized under the laws of the island; and

Whereas according to section 34 of the organic act of Puerto Rico approved March 2, 1917, the Congress of the United States reserves the power and authority to validate or annul all laws enacted by the Legislature of Puerto Rico: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the act of the fourth special session of the Twelfth Legislature of Puerto Rico entitled "An act authorizing the Governor of Puerto Rico to guarantee repayment, in the name of the people of Puerto Rico, of loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the agricultural credit corporations of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes," approved by the Governor of Puerto Rico on October 21, 1932, is hereby validated.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Connecticut make a brief explanation of the measure.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was authorized by the Congress to make loans to Puerto Rico. In order that they might do so properly, as to other States, it was necessary for the Legislature of Puerto Rico to pass an act authorizing the governor to prepare such papers as would guarantee the payment of the loan. It was ruled by the counsel for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that the Governor of Puerto Rico and the legislature did not have authority to enact such legislation under the organic act without validation by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And this gives that authority?

Mr. BINGHAM. This joint resolution does not give any authority, but it validates the act as it passed the legislature.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well, Mr. President; I see no objection to it.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13520) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 5337) to amend the Federal farm loan act, as amended, to permit loans for additional purposes, to extend the powers of Federal land banks in the making of direct loans, to authorize upon certain terms the reamortization of loans by Federal and joint-stock land banks, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, Mr. McFADDEN, and Mr. STRONG of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

DISPOSITION OF DETERIORATED EXPLOSIVES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives and calls the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to it.

The bill (H. R. 12047) to provide for the transfer of powder and other explosive materials from deteriorated and unserviceable ammunition under the control of the War Department to the Department of Agriculture for use in land clearing, drainage, road building, and other agricultural purposes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange deteriorated and unserviceable ammunition and components, and for other purposes," approved June 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 680; U. S. C., title 10, secs. 1209, 1210), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a section to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. In the administration of sections 1 and 2 of this act, as amended, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to transfer the powder and other explosive materials from such deteriorated and unserviceable ammunition and components thereof to the Secretary of Agriculture for distribution and sale in such amounts and at such times as the latter may determine, to farmers at not less than cost, under such regulations as he may prescribe, for use in land clearing, drainage, road building, and other agricultural purposes, by the Secretary of Agriculture. No expense in connection with such distribution and sale shall be borne by the War Department, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall reimburse the Secretary of War for the powder and explosive materials transferred under this section in amounts equal to the credits the Secretary of War would have received in an exchange under sections 1 and 2 of this act. Amounts so reimbursed are authorized to be made available for the expenditure by the War Department for ammunition or components thereof. The President is authorized to suspend the provisions of this section in case of national emergency."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, this bill proposes to reestablish a policy of selling defective explosives to farmers which was in operation from 1920 to 1928. During that period deteriorated explosives in the possession of the War Department were transferred to the Department of Agriculture and sold to farmers for use in blasting, principally in clearing land. The provision worked very well during the eight years it was on the statute books. The revolving fund created in the Department of Agriculture to carry on the work was augmented by approximately \$67,000 at the end of the period, due to the fact that the department charged a few cents per hundred more than the cost.

Under this bill it will be possible for the deteriorated explosives which are now, under the law, exchanged with the companies which manufacture explosives, to be turned over to the Department of Agriculture and the policy resumed of permitting these explosives to be sold to the farmers who desire to purchase them for land clearance.

There will be no expense to the War Department, nor will there be any loss to the Government, judging by past experience under the law as it was in operation from 1920 to 1928.

So far as I know, there is no opposition to the bill. It has passed the House of Representatives. General Hof, Chief of Ordnance, appeared and testified that the War Department had no objection to the bill providing an amendment was inserted which has been incorporated in the measure.

In view of the shortness of time before the adjournment, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill. I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who had charge of the legislation when it was previously enacted, and he is in agreement that the legislation is properly drawn, and that it is wise to enact the measure.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. KING. Has the Senator considered the wisdom of providing that, upon request of farm organizations, the War Department should turn over these deteriorated explosives? The point I have in mind is this, that we are perpetuating or creating another Federal agency in the Department of Agriculture, and the farmers have to go to the Department of Agriculture, if we do not arrange that they shall go to the places where explosives are obtained, without the interposition of an agency the cost of which, of course, would be upon the Federal Government.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Utah that my understanding is that the manner in which these explosives were made available to farmers heretofore under the law, from 1920 to 1928, was somewhat as follows: Arrangements were made by the department, through the agricultural colleges and experiment stations; and, through them, the agricultural county agents ascertained how many farmers in a particular area desired to purchase these deteriorated explosives suitable only, as I understand it, for blasting purposes.

They then certified the amount which was desired to be purchased in the particular community, the shipments were made, and a charge was made by the department sufficient to cover all of the cost; and, as I stated a moment ago, at the end of the 8-year period there was \$67,000 more money in the fund than at the time it was created, which I think should be some assurance to the Senator that this would not put any inordinate expense upon the Government.

At this particular time in many of these areas where lands are owned and awaiting clearance, the Senator knows there has been some influx of unemployed, people returning to their homes, and I believe that furnishing these explosives at reasonable prices would enable many of those who have thus returned to their homes to clear more land and to provide products for their own subsistence.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have no objection to the bill. I suggest to the Senator that a case was brought to my attention—I am not sure whether it involved explosives or not—in which it was claimed that some defective explosive was delivered and in handling it the person who got it was injured and insisted that the Government should pay for the injuries which he sustained. I suggest that the Department of Agriculture, if it does not do so, should take proper releases from persons who obtain these explosives, so that there will be no comeback on the Government.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So far as I know, Mr. President, no such claim has ever been given any serious consideration. Of course, persons handling explosives may be injured. Explosives are dangerous if handled by one who is not familiar with them. But, judging by previous experience, I think it is fair to state that these defective explosives were very helpful, and we can hope for a similar efficient administration of this provision of law if it is passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin that the Senate proceed to consider the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AIR TRANSPORT SERVICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8681) to develop American air transport services overseas, to encourage the construction in the United States by American capital of American airships for use in foreign commerce, and to make certain provisions of the maritime law applicable to foreign commerce by airship.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill has been heretofore laid before the Senate, and was temporarily laid aside.

Mr. KING. I shall have to ask for a quorum.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will not the Senator withhold that for a moment?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is my intention to ask that the bill now pending be temporarily laid aside and that we take up the District appropriation bill, which I have been holding back for two or three days, in order to allow other matters to go through. It is very important that we get this appropriation bill passed.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a motion?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

REGULATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN PANAMA CANAL

Mr. JOHNSON. Yesterday there came to us from the House Senate bill 4491, duly passed by the House with certain amendments. Thereupon, at the request of some of the members of the Committee on Commerce, which committee had reported the bill originally, I asked that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, that there be a conference, and that conferees be appointed. Conferees were thus appointed. The papers have not yet, I understand, gone over to the House. If they have, I want now to move that they be returned, because those who then asked that a conference be held now ask that the amendments be concurred in and that the bill become a law finally by action of the Senate.

I move first, Mr. President, that we rescind the action of the Senate by which conferees were appointed; and, if the papers have gone to the House, that they be recalled.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, to what bill does the Senator refer?

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] will recall Senate bill 4491, a shipping bill, which was passed by the Senate last year. The bill went to the House, and has been passed by the House now with certain amendments. I have just explained that it was asked of me by certain members of the Committee on Commerce that a conference be held, and acting for the Commerce Committee I made the motion; but those who then made the request have this morning told me that the amendments are satisfactory to them; and fearing that there would be no legislation of the character they desire, they have asked that the amendments of the House be concurred in and accepted, and on behalf of the committee I make this motion.

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator will be granted.

Mr. JOHNSON. I move now, Mr. President, that the amendments of the House on that bill be concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California moves that the Senate concur in the House amendments to House bill 4491.

The motion was agreed to.

POSTPONEMENT OF MORTGAGE FORECLOSURES

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, those who have indicated that they are especially interested in the bill (S. 5639) providing for loans or advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the purpose of securing the postponement of the foreclosure of certain mortgages for a period of two years, and for other purposes, have reached an agreement under which I think the bill can be passed without further debate.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I am interested. What is the agreement?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The agreement is to strike out section 5 which has relation to the advancing of \$100,000,000 to the joint-stock land banks. The whole section is to go out.

Mr. BROOKHART. Of course, I would much prefer to have the whole section remain in the bill, but I am for the bill with the section out.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. We propose to strike out that section and I think we can dispose of the bill and thus assure some chance of action by the body at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Does the amendment now proposed strike out the provision which allows the payment of mortgage interest and principal in the form of joint-stock land bank notes?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; the whole provision relating to the advance to joint-stock land banks in section 5 goes out of the bill under the arrangement, and if consent is given for just a few minutes I think we can dispose of the bill. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, may I inquire if this is what is known as the Hull-Walcott bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 5639) providing for loans or advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the purpose of securing the postponement of the foreclosure of certain mortgages for a period of two years, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, pursuant to the statement which I just made I move to amend by striking out section 5 of the bill and to renumber the sections.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. Has the matter been submitted to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT], the authors of the bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It has not been submitted to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], but I understand it is satisfactory to the other Senators interested.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that provision was not contained in the bill as introduced by the Senator from Tennessee. It was added by the committee just before the bill was reported and I am satisfied that its elimination would be satisfactory to the Senator from Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to strike out section 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further amendments the question is, Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time?

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PRICE HUFF

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11035) for the relief of Price Huff, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was told that the House had amended the Senate amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate and have asked for a conference.

Mr. REED. I move that the matter be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. At the time his request was submitted my attention was distracted. Did his request have reference to the War Department appropriation bill?

Mr. REED. No; it is a small private bill.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 14643) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICINAL LIQUORS

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COPELAND. Will the Chair tell me how I may bring up and get consideration of a bill relating to the prescribing of medicinal liquors? Can it be done by motion? I do not wish to displace the District of Columbia appropriation bill. Will the Chair please inform one who is ignorant of the particular procedure how he may get the bill before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The only way is by unanimous consent or by motion, which would displace the appropriation bill.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask unanimous consent that after the disposal of the District of Columbia appropriation bill and the bill of which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is in charge, the Senate shall proceed to consider the bill (H. R. 14395) relating to the prescribing of medicinal liquors.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I rise to request order. There is so much confusion in the Chamber that it is impossible to hear what is going on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. Will the Senator from New York repeat his request?

Mr. COPELAND. I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the District of Columbia appropriation bill and the bill of which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is in charge, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14395) relating to the prescribing of medicinal liquors. I ask that that bill may be made the order of business at that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there is so very much confusion in the Chamber I could not hear the Senator. What was his request?

The VICE PRESIDENT (rapping for order). The Senate will please be in order. The Senator from New York will restate his request.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the District of Columbia appropriation bill and the present unfinished business, the bill (H. R. 14395) relating to the prescribing of medicinal liquors may be made the order of business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. ODDIE. After that is disposed of I ask that the gasoline tax bill be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We must dispose of one matter at a time. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

Mr. BROOKHART. I object.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from Iowa objected to the proposed unanimous-consent arrangement. Would it be in order to move that that arrangement be entered into?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would take a two-thirds vote to make the bill a special order.

Mr. COPELAND. I am not sure that it would be wise to make such a motion at this time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LONG. Would it not be possible by a majority vote to proceed to the consideration of the medicinal liquor bill now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair stated that it might be done by a majority vote, but that it would set aside and displace both the pending appropriation bill and the unfinished business.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, may I appeal to the Senator from Iowa? The medicinal liquor bill is not a wet or dry proposition. It has been agreed to generally. It is agreed to by the Prohibition Bureau, by the Attorney General, by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and I know of no opposition from any dry organization. If the Senator will read the report submitted to the House he will learn the reasons why it is important to have the bill passed. I hope the Senator will withdraw his objection.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I have just taken some expert advice—medical advice, too—on the bill and I have had some experience in the courts on the medical-prescription stuff. I am not impressed by the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin, so I can not withdraw my objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I be allowed to inform the Senator from Iowa that I believe it would help improve what we are getting in the District of Columbia at the present time and would not lessen the quantity.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator is more of an expert on that matter than I am. [Laughter.] I insist upon my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made. The clerk will state the first amendment to the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14643) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 2, line 7, before the words "is appropriated," to strike out "\$6,500,000" and insert "\$9,500,000," so as to read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to defray the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, any revenue (not including the proportionate share of the United States in any revenue arising as the result of the expenditure of appropriations made for the fiscal year 1924 and prior fiscal years) now required by law to be credited to the District of Columbia and the United States in the same proportion that each contributed to the activity or source from whence such revenue was derived shall be credited wholly to the District of Columbia, and, in addition, \$9,500,000 is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be advanced July 1, 1933, and all the remainder out of the combined revenues of the District of Columbia, namely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

POSTPONEMENT OF MORTGAGE FORECLOSURES

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I was anxious to obtain the floor on yesterday, but I did not want to interfere with the

passage of the resolution which was then pending. It is not my purpose to discuss the amendment which has just been reported to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and I hope I shall occupy only a very brief period of the time of the Senate.

On Monday, when the so-called bankruptcy bill was before the Senate, it had been my intention to offer an amendment thereto. The amendment which I had intended to offer had been printed. I did not know that the Senate would complete consideration of the so-called bankruptcy bill on Monday evening. However, it was necessary for me to leave the Chamber about 5 o'clock, and after that hour the bankruptcy bill was passed and thus I had no opportunity to offer the amendment which I had intended to offer.

I then had intended to offer it as an amendment to the so-called Hull-Walcott bill (S. 5639) providing for loans or advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the purpose of securing the postponement of the foreclosure of certain mortgages for a period of two years. I have been necessarily absent from the Chamber for a while, and I am just this minute informed that that bill was passed a few moments ago. There was no quorum call. I am very much interested in that bill. I therefore find myself in a position where I can not offer to that bill the amendment which I had intended to offer to the bankruptcy bill. Therefore, I am persuaded to move that the vote by which the Hull-Walcott bill was passed shall be reconsidered.

There were a number of Senators who were interested in the bill, but there was no quorum called. I understand that does not excuse a Member in any respect whatever, but in the confusion that exists here on the floor it is sometimes impossible to know what business the Senate is really transacting. I do not understand why there should be any urge for haste; at least there ought to be an opportunity to consider such important legislation. For that reason, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will suggest that the motion should be entered now, the bill not being before the Senate at this time.

Mr. BLAINE. May I inquire where the bill is, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator might move to proceed to the consideration of the motion to reconsider, but that would displace the pending appropriation bill, unless it were done by unanimous consent.

Mr. BLAINE. I should like to know whether the bill is in the Senate or where it may be, so that we may know what course to pursue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is just informed that the bill is in the office of the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin, if it will serve his purpose, that he simply enter the motion to reconsider and let us consider the proposition later. Would that be satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. BLAINE. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed may be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin that the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to and the bill passed may be reconsidered?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I gave notice yesterday and to-day that at the first possible opportunity the bill to which the Senator from Wisconsin refers would be brought before the Senate. I took the first opportunity to do that. An arrangement was entered into which made the bill satisfactory to those who have been heretofore opposing it. There are only two days of the session remaining. If any opportunity is to be afforded the House of Representatives to consider this bill, which is designed to stop for a period of two years foreclosures of farm mortgages, the bill must get to the House at a very early hour. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will not insist upon reconsidering the vote by which the bill was passed. If he does so it may defeat all prospect for the legislation.

What is the amendment that the Senator wishes to propose? I understood him to say it had relationship to the bankruptcy act.

Mr. BLAINE. The amendment I have mentioned is the same as Senate bill 5640, a bill to liquidate, finance, and refinance agricultural indebtedness. It was particularly germane not only to the bankruptcy bill but also to the Hull-Walcott bill bearing upon the same subject, dealing with the same proposition. I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas that it is not my purpose to delay the passage of the Hull-Walcott bill. I am, indeed, unfortunate in this that I am not privileged to be on the Senate floor at all times, and while I do not offer that as an excuse, yet, Mr. President, it was understood here this morning that after the disposal of the Black resolution we would take up the bill, as I understand, that came over from the House of Representatives relating to some subsidy for ocean mail service by lighter-than-air craft, and that that bill would be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia. Resting upon that assumption, I was absent from the Chamber when the Hull-Walcott bill was called up, considered by unanimous consent, and disposed of.

Mr. President, as I understand, the bill has not been messaged to the other House. If I should enter a motion to reconsider, would that have the effect of retaining the bill in the possession of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I am not anxious to retain that bill in the Senate for any great length of time; it is not my purpose to delay its consideration; but if I am forced into this situation, then, Mr. President, I shall enter the motion.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. As I understand, the bill to which the Senator refers, which he seeks now to incorporate into the measure which recently passed the Senate relating to the suspension of farm-mortgage foreclosures, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and no action whatever was taken by that committee. It is apparent to me that to reopen this question and inject into it so large a proposition as is involved in the bill of the Senator from Wisconsin will result in the failure of all legislation relating to mortgage foreclosures. I should like very much, of course, to accede to the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin for reconsideration, but it occurs to me that the bill which he seeks to incorporate as an amendment to the measure already passed is one of very great importance.

The subject matter of this bill has been under consideration by the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate for some weeks; the committee is continuing its hearings on the subject; it has made no report, and I am morally sure that if the question shall be reopened the only result of doing so will be to deprive the body at the other end of the Capitol of all opportunity to consider the proposed legislation for the suspension of farm-mortgage foreclosures as provided in the so-called Hull-Walcott bill.

I hope the Senator will treat his bill as an independent proposition and not insist upon attaching it as an amendment to the bill that has already passed, for to do that, as already stated, would make necessary reconsideration and probably provoke a prolonged discussion in the Senate. Only two days remain of the session, and that is little enough time; indeed, it is too little time for the body at the other end of the Capitol to act on the so-called Hull-Walcott bill. It is certain that to open this very large proposition, which is of very great importance, and which is incorporated, perhaps, in a half dozen measures before the Committee on Banking and Currency, will be to encompass the defeat of all such legislation. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin can see his way clear to treat his own bill independently.

Mr. BLAINE. I would be very happy to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas, but I have a deep

sense of responsibility respecting legislation for the aid of agriculture. In my humble opinion, the bill which I introduced, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, goes to the very root of the difficulties that confront agriculture, while all other bills that have passed the Congress or passed the Senate or passed the House of Representatives are largely in the nature of attempts to extend the time when debts will finally come due and must be paid, to create additional debtor classes, and to heap a greater burden upon agriculture even than it now bears.

I do not regard the bill to which I refer as one that needs a great deal of explanation. It is a very simple proposition. I undertake to adjust the present machinery of the Federal land-bank system to the plan which is outlined in the bill, and it seems to me, Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that this bill is before the Committee on Banking and Currency, that it should be taken up and considered by the Senate.

I wish to recur to the so-called bankruptcy bill and to state that one section of that bill, as I recall, received no hearing whatever at the hands of any committee. I refer to the railroad section of the bill, which was not considered by the Judiciary Committee; in fact, as I understand, only one section of that bill was given consideration there; that was the individual-debtor section, and that received scarcely any consideration whatever by the Judiciary Committee, indeed, not more than 15 minutes being devoted to the consideration of that bill. Yet there was a persistent and insistent demand here that that legislation should be considered by the Senate.

The character of the bill to which I refer is of far more importance to agriculture than all the legislation, embracing some 30 bills, that has passed the Congress in very recent years. It ought to be given consideration.

Therefore, Mr. President, if we are to give the farmers of this country any hope whatever for the restoration of agriculture, it must be through some plan by which the capital structure will be reorganized and the entire system of financing agriculture will be reorganized. It is not going to be reorganized and saved through any system of advancements whereby additional debtor classes and additional agricultural obligations are created. There has not been a single bill passed by this Congress in the six years during which I have been here that has, in fact, reduced agricultural indebtedness one penny. The effect of every bill looking toward the financing of agriculture that has passed the Congress has been to increase agricultural indebtedness in this country, and to heap higher interest upon interest, compounded interest, and debts upon debts.

So, Mr. President, when this great industry faces the situation so familiar to all of us, I think the Senate of the United States can take a few hours in the consideration of a bill which goes to the proposition of an entire refinancing plan for agriculture in America.

Now, Mr. President, I desire briefly, for the information of the Senate, to outline the provisions of the bill.

Under section 2—I am speaking now of S. 5640, introduced by myself—the Federal Farm Loan Board is directed to liquidate, finance, and refinance all farm mortgages and farm indebtedness, and to extend credit to farmers eligible under the Federal farm loan act, which eligibility is set forth in paragraph 6 of section 12 of the Federal farm loan act.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I assume that my motion to reconsider has been entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DICKINSON in the chair). It has.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: As I understand, the Senator from Wisconsin has made a motion to reconsider, or given notice of an intention to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has entered the motion.

Mr. CLARK. Then he has made the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has entered the motion.

Mr. CLARK. Then, Mr. President, if he has made the motion to reconsider, a further parliamentary inquiry: Is

a motion to lay the motion to reconsider on the table now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. CLARK. Then, Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor, and the Senator from Missouri has simply trespassed upon my good nature. I am not unwilling to yield for a question.

Mr. CLARK. But, Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the Senator from Wisconsin originally gave notice of a motion to reconsider, proceeded to address himself to the subject matter which he desired reconsidered, and now proceeds to enter the motion, at which time a motion to lay on the table should be in order.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that a motion to lay the motion to reconsider on the table is in order.

Mr. BLAINE. I have not made a motion.

Mr. JOHNSON. I make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON. If merely a motion to reconsider has been entered, how is it possible to move to lay it on the table before the motion is made?

Mr. CLARK. The Chair stated—

Mr. JOHNSON. I think the Chair is in error.

Mr. CLARK. That is what I was trying to find out. The Chair stated that the motion to reconsider had been entered, had been made. Therefore a motion to lay it on the table should be in order.

Mr. JOHNSON. My understanding of what the Senator from Wisconsin has done is simply to propose a motion to reconsider, and not to enter a motion or make a motion to reconsider at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NORRIS. Is it not necessary, in order to make a motion to lay on the table, that the Senator should have the floor when he makes it? Can he interject, without getting permission of the Senator who has the floor, and make that motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is correct.

Mr. CLARK. But, Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin originally gave notice of an intention to make a motion to reconsider, and then interrupted his own speech to make the motion to reconsider, at which time a motion to lay on the table should be in order without obtaining the floor from the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the Senator from Wisconsin did not yield the floor except for a parliamentary inquiry, which is always in order, but not for the purpose of making a motion to lay on the table. The Senator from Wisconsin still has the floor.

Mr. WALCOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: Do I understand that the motion for reconsideration has actually been declared adopted?

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. WALCOTT. Then it is merely before the Senate. It has merely been entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just entered.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, a point of order. I did not understand the Senator from Wisconsin to make any motion but to give notice of his intention to make the motion at some future time.

Mr. BLAINE. I entered the motion. The motion can be made later on and passed upon.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I think there was confusion at the desk. The Senator from Wisconsin has not made a motion to reconsider. He has simply announced that he entered the motion. The entering of the motion is not subject to tabling; and that was the confusion.

Mr. CLARK. There is no dispute about that. If the Senator from Wisconsin has not made his motion to reconsider—

Mr. FESS. He has not.

Mr. CLARK. I do not contend that I am entitled to make a motion to lay on the table. If he has made it, I submit that I am entitled to make a motion to lay on the table.

Mr. FESS. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. That was the substance of my parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Wisconsin whether he made a motion to reconsider.

Mr. BLAINE. I desired to enter a motion to reconsider.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator merely gave notice that he would make a motion. That simplifies the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry in order to clarify the situation. What is the technical difference between entering a motion and making a motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, in practical effect there is no particular difference; but the Senator from Wisconsin has had the floor all the time, and has not yielded it for any purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. He could not give notice of a motion and enter a motion and then make the motion, all with the same holding of the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. He has not done that.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BLAINE. I do.

Mr. FESS. The difference is that entering the motion to reconsider suspends it, and it may not be called up after the adjournment of the Senate unless some one makes the motion.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Why, Mr. President, a Senator entering a motion to reconsider may make the motion within two days unless some other Senator gets the floor and makes it sooner. Any Senator has the right to make the motion, having voted in the affirmative, if he can get the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, there is some confusion. Anyone can make the motion to reconsider within two days; but if he enters it, then he can make it within a year afterwards if he wants to. That is why we enter the motion; and the entering of this motion can defeat this legislation entirely.

Mr. BARKLEY. The entering of a motion may postpone action indefinitely.

Mr. FESS. Certainly.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. BLAINE. As I understand the parliamentary situation, the bill is still in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BLAINE. Now, Mr. President, I will proceed with an explanation of Senate bill 5640, which I had intended to offer as an amendment to the Hull-Walcott bill.

While probably repeating, I point out that under section 2 the Federal Farm Loan Board is directed to liquidate, finance, and refinance all farm mortgages and farm indebtedness, and to extend credit to farmers eligible under the Federal farm loan act, which eligibility is set forth in paragraph 6 of section 12 of the Federal farm loan act, providing that loans shall be made to any person who is engaged or is about to engage in the cultivation of the farm proposed to be mortgaged, with not exceeding 3 per cent interest and 1 per cent on the principal per annum.

The maximum loan is fixed at \$15,000, but preference shall be given to applications for loans of \$5,000 and under. This limitation is necessary in order to prevent the financing of corporate farming and to discourage speculation in farm

lands. The bill limits the financing to the farmer-owned and farmer-operated farm.

The facilities of the Federal land banks shall be used for the purpose of carrying out this act.

Under Section 3, the funds with which to carry out the refinancing of agriculture shall be provided by the issuing of farm-loan bonds by the Federal farm-loan system, through the Federal Farm Loan Board and the Federal land banks, the bonds to bear interest at the rate of not to exceed 3 per cent, and to be secured by first mortgages on farms. The Treasurer of the United States is authorized to invest the proceeds of the franchise tax received from the Federal reserve system, amounting now to about \$150,000,000, to support the par value of the bonds.

Under Section 4, if all the farm-loan bonds are not readily purchased, then the Federal land banks shall present the remainder to the Federal reserve banks, which shall forthwith issue and deliver to the Federal land banks Federal reserve bank notes, which are now provided for by the Federal reserve act. Federal-reserve-bank notes are of substantially the same character as Federal-reserve notes and other currency issued against securities and collateral. This provision does not introduce into our monetary system any different character of currency than is now possible under existing laws.

One-half of all payments of interest are to be placed in a sinking fund invested in municipal, State, or United States Government bonds, to assure the stability of the bonds and also as an assurance against defaults in the bonds.

The Federal Farm Loan Board is to continue as the governmental agency to supervise the Federal land banks.

By section 6 of the bill, a board of agriculture, consisting of four members from each land-bank district, to be elected by the farmers in a practical and democratic way, is created. Such board of agriculture will be the liaison officers between the farmers and the Federal Farm Loan Board and the Federal land banks, and will directly represent the farmer borrowers. That board will meet annually, and each member is paid a reasonable per diem with necessary traveling expenses while on official business.

Such board of agriculture will select an executive committee consisting of three as the immediate and direct representatives of the board of agriculture, and thus the representatives of the borrowing farmers, and they shall be paid a salary of \$7,500 a year and traveling expenses while on official business. The executive committee will conduct the general business in behalf of the board of agriculture and the borrowing farmers.

The details of the method of electing the board of agriculture and selecting the executive committee thereof are provided for in sections 7, 8, 9, and 10.

Sections 11, 12, and 13 specify in broad terms the powers and duties of the board of agriculture and the executive committee thereof. The trouble now respecting agricultural loans through any Federal agency is that bureaucratic organizations have been built up, without much regard for agriculture.

The board of agriculture and the executive committee, being direct representatives of the borrowing farmers, will emphasize at all times the fact that agriculture is the foundation of our economic structure.

The executive committee of the board of agriculture is to counsel with and supervise the work of the liquidating, financing and refinancing of farm mortgages and farm indebtedness, and shall have power, in case of crop failure or other emergency, to extend the time payments due on loans from time to time for a period not exceeding three years, provided that the mortgagor pays the taxes and insurance premiums on the mortgaged property.

The bill is brief and readily understood. Practically all of the red tape under the Federal farm loan act is eliminated. There will be no stock issued by the Federal land banks, and the Federal land banks will be put in a position to liquidate and settle farm mortgages owned by them or by any other financial institution or by individuals, and thus

liquidation can proceed without severe shock to farmers who are now swamped with farm indebtedness.

For future farming, as to all future loans, the plan set up under this proposal will be a separate and distinct organization, using the facilities of the Federal Farm Loan Board, an existing governmental agency, as the administrative agency, in cooperation with the board of agriculture and the executive committee thereof, for long-term financing. All other Federal farm-loan agencies or undertakings will liquidate, through the usual processes, and will cease to function, without further or other legislation, except temporary emergency agencies. Such agencies always have existed and always will exist whenever there is an emergency that should be met. But as to long-term financing, all governmental agencies of every character will go out of business in the usual processes of liquidation.

I understand that the refinancing of farm mortgages will not exceed from a billion to two billion dollars a year, and as the Federal reserve bank notes are issued, such issue, in the course of banking practices, will gradually retire other currency issues, or the various currency issues will be interchangeable, to accommodate agriculture, commerce, and industry.

The plan is not designed as an inflationary measure. I have endeavored to divorce the financing of farmers from all inflationary proposals. Inflationary proposals should be considered separate and aside from the proposals contained in the bill, as the refinancing of agriculture should not be caught in the jam of the controversy over inflationary measures.

I ask that the bill be printed in full in the RECORD at this place in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be known by the title "the farm loan act."

SEC. 2. The Federal Farm Loan Board is hereby authorized and directed to liquidate, finance, and refinance farm mortgages and other farm indebtedness now existing and to make loans and extend credit to farmers eligible under the Federal farm loan act, as amended, secured by first mortgages on farms, to an amount equal to 80 per cent of the fair value of such farms, including the land mortgaged and the value of insurable buildings and improvements thereon, through the facilities of the Federal farm-land banks and national farm-loan associations, and to make all necessary rules and regulations for the carrying out of the purposes of this act: *Provided, however,* That the amount of loans to any one borrower shall in no case exceed a maximum of \$15,000, nor shall any one loan be for a less sum than \$100, but preference shall be given to applications for loans of \$5,000 and under, such loans to be made at a rate not to exceed 3 per cent interest and 1 per cent principal per annum.

SEC. 3. The funds with which to carry out the provisions of section 2 hereof shall be provided by the issuing of farm-loan bonds by the Federal farm-loan system, through the Federal Farm Loan Board and Federal land banks, as now provided by law, which bonds shall bear interest at the rate of not to exceed 3 per cent per annum and be secured by first mortgages on farms. Such bonds, after delivery to the Federal Farm Loan Board, may by it be sold at par to any individual or corporation, or to any State, National, or Federal reserve bank, domestic or foreign, or to the Treasurer of the United States. The Treasurer of the United States is authorized to invest the proceeds of the franchise tax received from the Federal reserve system to support the par value of the bonds issued pursuant to this act.

SEC. 4. In case all of said farm-loan bonds are not readily purchased the Federal land banks shall present the remainder to such Federal reserve bank or banks as the Federal Farm Loan Board and the Federal Reserve Board shall designate, and said reserve bank or banks shall forthwith issue and deliver to the aforesaid land banks Federal reserve bank notes, as now provided by law, to an amount equal to the par value of such bonds as are presented. Such farm-loan bonds are to be offered by Federal reserve banks and accepted by Federal reserve agents as the sole security for all Federal reserve bank notes issued under the provisions of this act: *Provided, however,* That bonds issued prior to the effective date of this act under the Federal farm loan act shall not participate in any of the funds, securities, or benefits provided for in this act.

SEC. 5. The Federal land banks shall turn over one-half of all payments of interest and principal on such farm-loan bonds, for which the Federal reserve banks issue Federal reserve bank notes, to the reserve banks holding such bonds, and shall be by them reinvested as a sinking fund in municipal or State bonds and in bonds of the United States Government, to meet defaults in such bonds and to assure against the depreciation of such bonds.

SEC. 6. There is hereby created a board of agriculture consisting of four members from each land-bank district, elected by the farmers of such districts, who shall be elected biennially by delegates selected by a mass convention of at least 10 farmers in each county or parish within the United States, who are indebted and declare it to be their intention to take advantage of this act: *Provided, however,* That all elections held subsequent to the year 1933 shall be participated in solely by members of the national farm-loan associations, and that in the election of members of the board of agriculture each district delegate shall be eligible to cast as many votes as there are members in his national farm-loan association, county, or parish convention.

SEC. 7. The district delegates so elected shall meet at the situs of their respective land banks and elect four members of the board of agriculture, who shall hold their offices from the date of such election and for a period of two years from March 4 following, and who shall receive \$15 per diem and necessary traveling expenses and subsistence while on official business, to be paid by the United States Government.

SEC. 8. The Federal Farm Loan Board is hereby authorized and directed to give public notice, through the Federal land banks, to the farmers of each county or parish of the time and place of holding the first county or parish convention, which shall be held at the seat of government of each county or parish; and it shall at the same time give notice of the first convention of the district delegates, to be held in the city in which the land bank is located, notice of such convention to be given at an early date after the passage of this act.

SEC. 9. The farmers attending such county or parish convention and the district delegates attending such district convention shall organize and make such rules and regulations for their procedure as they deem necessary or convenient, and shall elect a president and a secretary and make arrangements for such other and future conventions as they may deem necessary, and they shall at all times cooperate and assist the board of agriculture, the Federal Farm Loan Board, the Federal land banks, and national farm-loan associations in carrying out the provisions of this act: *Provided,* That subsequent to the 1933 elections all national farm-loan associations shall succeed to the powers and duties heretofore conferred upon parish and county conventions.

SEC. 10. Immediately after their election the members of the board of agriculture, upon call of the Federal Farm Loan Board, shall meet at Washington, D. C., and organize by electing a chairman and a secretary, and they shall make such rules and regulations as they deem necessary and expedient in carrying out the purposes of this act. They shall elect an executive committee of three, none of whom shall be members of the board of agriculture, who shall hold their office at the will of said board, and who shall receive a salary of \$7,500 per annum, and necessary traveling expenses and subsistence while on official business, to be paid by the United States Government.

SEC. 11. The members of the board of agriculture shall report to the executive committee the progress of liquidating, financing, and refinancing farm mortgages and farm indebtedness in their respective districts.

SEC. 12. The executive committee of the board of agriculture shall counsel with and supervise the work of liquidating, financing, and refinancing farm mortgages and farm indebtedness by the Federal Farm Loan Board and the Federal Reserve Board. They shall report any member of the farm loan system or the Federal Reserve Board who neglects, hinders, or delays the carrying out of the provisions of this act to the President of the United States, who may thereupon remove any such person.

SEC. 13. The executive committee of the board of agriculture shall have power in case of crop failures or other emergency to extend the time payments due on loans made under this act from time to time for a period not exceeding three years, provided that the mortgagor pays the taxes and insurance premiums on the mortgaged property.

SEC. 14. The provisions of the Federal farm-loan system and the Federal reserve banking system shall apply as far as applicable in carrying out of the provisions of this act; and all laws or parts of laws in conflict herewith are for the purpose of this act repealed.

SEC. 15. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum sufficient to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, this bill, as every Senator will appreciate, is germane to the Hull-Walcott bill. I shall analyze the Hull-Walcott bill. I do not recall the amendments which have been adopted, but they do not affect materially the bill as it was reported to the Senate.

What does the Hull bill do? It is to be administered through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is to make available half a billion dollars, that is, \$500,000,000, for what purpose? To lend to the farmer? No. To lend to the mortgagor? No. To whom is the loan to be made? Under the Hull-Walcott bill the loan is to be made to the creditor of the farmer, to be made to the mortgagee, and that mortgagee, I assume, may be a bank, an investment company, a life insurance company, any corporation or any individual. So the Hull-Walcott bill is not a measure to refinance agricul-

ture. There can be nothing else read out of the bill than that it is a bill to create another class of debtors.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator realizes, of course, that it has been the policy of Congress, in providing funds to be loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to provide that they shall accept primary security in return for the loans. The farmers who are intended to be protected or relieved by this measure are those who already have first mortgages on their farms, and who have been unable to pay the interest or amortization or taxes for a period of 6 or 12 months, as the case may be.

Manifestly, where a farmer has already given, either to a land bank, or a joint-stock land bank, or to an insurance company, or to any other organization or to an individual, a first mortgage on his farm, he could not give another first mortgage, and the Government has never yet been willing or consented to accept second security for the money which it lends.

Therefore, in order to make this bill of any service whatsoever to delinquent farmers, it was necessary to make the loan to somebody who could give the Government equal security with that which they hold themselves, and only in cases where the lender to the farmer has paid the taxes, or taken care of the delinquent interest or amortization, can this money be loaned in lieu of the loan to the farmer, because he can not give to the Government a first mortgage on his property, somebody else holding a first mortgage from him. That is the reason why this bill provides that the money shall be loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the mortgagee, because the mortgagor is not in a position to give the Government any security that is acceptable.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I am well aware of the situation which the Senator describes, but I wonder whether the Senator from Kentucky can with his mind's eye get a picture of the farmer with a first mortgage on his farm who is in default in interest, principal, and taxes. Of what benefit is it going to be to that farmer to have additional advances made by the Government of the United States through this intermediary body? The Senator ought to know that the cost involved in the transaction is a cost that is going to be paid by the farmer, when the mortgagee consents to do what is prescribed. So it is an attempt simply to heap upon the farmer another burden.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there would not only be no additional cost, but the farmer would get a material reduction in the interest which he would have to pay to the mortgagee, and he would get an assurance that there would be no foreclosure proceedings instituted for at least two years. In the present circumstances, when we are trying to pass some legislation to hold off foreclosures until Congress can pass a permanent law for refinancing farm mortgages, and get a rate of interest of 4 per cent, something to enable the farmer to feel safe for at least two years would certainly be of some benefit and some relief to the distressed farmers of this country.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has not in his mind's eye this farmer to whom I refer.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have had nothing else in my mind's eye for weeks. I know all about him. He exists in my State, no less than in Wisconsin, and in all the other parts of the country. The mail of all of us has been burdened with the pleas of the farmers, who are being put off their farms by foreclosure proceedings, to do something to relieve them; if we can not do something for permanent relief at this session, to do something temporarily, until we can pass a permanent act.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I still insist that the Senator has not this farmer in his mind's eye. He can ride along the beautiful paved highways of the State of Kentucky and see the farmsteads as he goes along, but I fear that the Senator from Kentucky has not been in very close communication with many farmers in the United States. I think that if the Senator had had some recent experience with

lending agencies, he would have found that neither the farmer nor the mortgagee could turn his hand without somebody taxing him for some charge and for some costs. Whatever the provisions of this bill may be, it will be found that in the end there will be necessity for abstracts, the examination of the abstracts, appraisals, expenditures of every class and character, and somebody will have to pay the bill; and in the past, with respect to all these projects, it has been Mr. Farmer who has paid the freight. What assurance is there that the farmer is protected against that burden by anything in this bill? There is none at all.

Of course, Farmer Jones always pays the freight. It is true that he would receive a reduction in interest on a small portion of debt. A loan might be made for default for more than six months in the payment of mortgage interest and principal due under the terms of the mortgage and delinquent taxes in arrears for more than 12 months, and during the 2-year period the rate of interest, is 4 per cent; but on the balance of the debt—that is, the greater portion of the debt—the old rate, compounded, perhaps, will continue.

Mr. President, under the provisions of the Hull-Walcott bill, for two years there is a postponement of the defaulted interest and principal and taxes. After the 2-year period has gone by, what happens to the farmer? I again ask the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to place in his mind's eye the farmer. Two years have passed by. Not one dollar has the debt been reduced. In the meantime there has been an accumulation of taxes. The same old rate of interest, all the way from 5 to 8 per cent, on the balance of the principal, which constitutes the largest part of the farmer's indebtedness, is grinding on. For the 2-year period that interest on the balance of the principal is not discharged under the bill. Moreover, during the 2-year period, while the farmer is struggling along, 4 per cent interest is charged on a small portion of the indebtedness, but the interest upon the interest on the balance of the principal is piling higher and higher. At the end of two years what do we have?

We will assume a farmer's mortgage of \$10,000. We will assume that his default is \$1,000. The \$1,000 principal in default, and taxes and interest, bears 4 per cent interest. Then we have \$9,000 in addition to the \$1,000 in default, and interest upon that at the old rate. At the end of the first year of the 2-year period we have the interest upon the interest. We have the accumulation of taxes during the two years. At the end of the 2-year period we have all these accumulations of interest, taxes, interest upon the principal plus the defaulted interest, principal, and taxes, and the interest upon those items, heaped upon the farmer.

Can any Senator for one moment conscientiously suggest to a farmer in debt to the extent of \$10,000 that he is being offered a single item or penny of relief? I doubt if there is a Senator on the floor of the Chamber at this time who would have the courage—no, the dishonesty, if you please—to suggest to a farmer that he will receive any relief whatever so far as the actual financial condition of the farmer is concerned. It is preposterous. It is worse than preposterous. It is deception. How long are we going to continue thus to deceive the farmer?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. What the Senator is pointing out would depend altogether on the regulations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There is nothing in the law that requires them to make these charges. The law does not require a reduction of the interest.

Mr. BLAINE. The original indebtedness still continues to bear the original rate of interest fixed in the bond or the note the farmer has given.

Mr. FLETCHER. Only the advances due to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that take up the interest, installments, and taxes.

Mr. BLAINE. That is 4 per cent.

Mr. FLETCHER. Under the farm loan act the borrower has to pay 8 per cent.

Mr. BLAINE. Yes; he is getting a small reduction on the interest, taxes, and the installment unpaid, which is a very small portion of the total indebtedness. He is getting that reduction for two years, but point out to me what substantial relief that is to the farmer.

Mr. FLETCHER. It stops foreclosure for two years. No one can foreclose his mortgage.

Mr. BLAINE. Oh, it stops the foreclosure! Better that the foreclosure had proceeded than to chain that farmer to servitude of more debts for two years. Relief to agriculture? No, Mr. President, it is deception.

Mr. President, the proposal in the Hull-Walcott bill is a moratorium, but it is a moratorium in the true sense. It means financial death to agriculture and to the farmer who is driven to accept this type of deceptive legislation. Then Senators urge the necessity of the bill immediately going to the House, that it should not be delayed for a single moment, that it should not be considered for any length of time, that no amendments should be considered, but it should be driven through the Congress.

I submit if we would have an upturn in affairs in the next year or in the next two years, so that the farmer might receive cost of production plus a reasonable profit for the products of his farm, then indeed it might serve the farmer some to stay the possibility of foreclosure, even though such a harsh measure is applied. But when agriculture has a capital structure such as was builded during the war, such as was builded during the period of inflation, it is unfair to the present generation of farmers, it is a crime against the future generation of farmers, to tie the farmers and the future generations of farmers to a capital structure, the support of which will mean absolute and abject slavery for the farmers. The farmer's back is bent under the present load of debt. Under the scheme proposed by the Hull-Walcott bill his back will break under the added load of debt.

My objection to the bill to which I called attention, the additional charge to the farmer, can be dismissed. I simply pointed out the fact that some one is going to pay those charges. But that is not the material weakness of the bill. In fact I could waive that. My objection is that it is being represented to the farmer, and the farmer is being deceived into believing that we are extending him aid by creating another class of debtors and putting the farmer deeper in debt.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am not very well posted on the provisions of the bill, but I have understood that the bill would grant a two-year extension on mortgages and reduce the rate of interest. That is all I thought the bill did. I thought it allowed the farmers an extension of their mortgages for two years instead of foreclosing them now, and reduced the rate of interest from 8 per cent to 4 per cent. I would like to see a lot more done for the farmer, but it does that much, does it not?

Mr. BLAINE. Yes; but how much is that?

Mr. LONG. It is not enough.

Mr. BLAINE. It is nothing. It is worse than nothing.

Mr. LONG. Oh, I do not agree to that.

Mr. BLAINE. It is a moratorium, it is true, but it is financial death to the farmer. It means financial sacrifice to the farmer, binding him for two years to more debts.

Mr. LONG. Is it not better to give him two years than to close him out now?

Mr. BLAINE. A farmer who is going to be closed out in two years ought not be deceived. He ought to save, presently, something from the wreck. To deceive him for another two years is placing him under a system of involuntary servitude for that period.

Mr. WALCOTT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. WALCOTT. The term "involuntary servitude," it seems to me, is pretty far-fetched. I shall take only a moment of the time of the Senator from Wisconsin, but he has just stated that it would be better for the farmers to have their farm mortgages foreclosed now than to be placed under the conditions of the bill. He now suggests that to have their mortgages extended for two years puts them in a condition of "involuntary servitude."

Mr. BLAINE. Let me interrupt the Senator. I do not want the Senator in my time to lead the Senate to believe that this bill does what he is now saying it will do. The Senator is evidently not very familiar with the bill that he prepared or assisted in preparing. The bill does not reduce the rate of interest on the mortgage debt. It simply reduces the interest on that part of the debt—that is, the delinquent taxes, the defaulted interest, and the default in installment payments—but the interest on the balance of the debt which constitutes the main portion of the principal indebtedness. The rate of interest, if it is 8 per cent, continues throughout those two years and the taxes and compounded interest mount higher and the total debt increases.

Mr. WALCOTT. Mr. President, that is perfectly correct. I do not claim that there is any reduction in the interest or the principal of the debt, and, in my own time, I shall explain it further, but I do claim that the bill, if enacted, will afford an enormous moral and mental relief to the thousands upon thousands of mortgagors who have had their mortgages foreclosed and those who are facing foreclosure; and I can show the enormous increase in the number of those mortgagors and the importance of bringing them quick temporary relief while we work out some permanent plan. This bill, I claim, will afford that relief.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, the Senator when he first interrupted me, as I recall, said that when I used the language "involuntary servitude" I was using pretty strong language. There is no other or truer characterization of this measure than that it is "involuntary servitude" for two years for the farmer. His consent is not obtained but only the consent of the mortgagee. The mortgagor is led to believe he is getting something; a deception is being worked upon him; the farmer is being fooled. The Senator knows and I know that no farmer under this bill, should it become a law, is going to receive a single dollar by which he can discharge his indebtedness. Can there be any other result? I am not claiming the Senator is engaged in any personal deception; it is a legislative deception; and it is not the intent of course of any Senator personally to offer this as a deceptive piece of legislation; but nevertheless it is deceptive legislation; it is fooling the farmer, and I have undertaken to point out wherein it fools the farmer.

Mr. WALCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. WALCOTT. It not only is not deception, but if the farmer does not wish to accept the offer which this bill would allow to be tendered him he does not have to do so. There is nothing forced on the farmer. It is a purely voluntary act on his part; and that offer, if he chooses to accept it, will bring him the relief that his farm and his home can not be taken away from him for two years while Congress is considering a more permanent measure. If that is deception, then I do not know the meaning of the word. That, to my mind, is a kindness, although it is not saving any dollars of his with the exception of foregoing a part of the interest which he has to pay to the mortgagee. The Senator from Wisconsin and I agree entirely on that. It is not expected to be charity, but it is offering him something that has real value for his mental and moral relief and for his actual financial relief, provided conditions get better in the next two years and the prices of his commodities pick up and allow him again to earn money.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I am quite sure the farmers of this country will be very happy; they will be delighted; indeed, they will be cheered when they learn from the lips of the Senator from Connecticut that this is to be a "moral

and a mental relief" to agriculture. Agriculture is not deficient either in mentality or morality; and the farmer does not need either the "moral relief" or the "mental relief" that these guardians of the farmer want to extend to him. God pity the farmer if he is to have this guardianship extended over his life and the life of his family even for the period of two years. I thought the cat would soon get out of the bag if we could have this bill considered for a reasonable time.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BLAINE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. All we have been giving the farmer in the last four years is moral and mental relief, is it not?

Mr. BLAINE. Yes, and that is what the farmer has been getting for a long time from business men and bankers who have wrecked the country and who have wrecked our economic structure. The farmer has been receiving gratuitous advice from those gentlemen, and now he is to receive the guardianship of other gentlemen in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I perhaps have used some very strong language, but I think it is justifiable. Oh, it is true that the farmer must sign up something, I presume, on the dotted line. He has got to acknowledge his poverty of course, he must go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and acknowledge his poverty. That is true. He will do that voluntarily, I presume; yes, he must execute and acknowledge a certificate setting out the facts as to his default in the payment of taxes; he must certify that he has not paid the interest; he must certify that he has not paid the installments which are due, and the mortgagee is thereupon to be paid such delinquent taxes in accordance with the terms of the mortgage.

So the farmer must come as a beggar on his knees and certify to his poverty, so that the mortgagee may be put in the debtor class as an intermediary between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the farmer, and then it is said that this is offering relief to agriculture. If I were at a crossroads or on the farm, my characterization of this legislation would be expressed in one word—bunk!

I think I know something about the farmers—at least the farmers in my State. It has been my privilege to live among the farmers during my lifetime and to have undertaken to serve agriculture of my State, as I understood it, not only in a personal way but also in an official way and also in a neighborly way; and I think I understand something about agriculture. I think I understand something about the mental operations of the farmers—the organized farmers and the unorganized farmers. During the 4 years—yes; during the last 12 years—of agitation I have yet to find a single communication from an individual farmer, either from my own State or any other State of the Union, ever suggesting that the Congress of the United States should undertake to perpetrate upon the farmers of this country the deception that is contained in the bill known as the Hull-Walcott bill. After the farmer has dragged himself through his poverty and made complete confession of that poverty before some notary public or some other official, after he has certified to his poverty and to his distress, then the mortgagee may obtain a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Now, let us take a few more views of the farmer; let us look at him back upon the farm. Perhaps the mortgagee was his predecessor upon that farm; perhaps the mortgagee was once a farmer who operated that farm and sold it to the mortgagor. Mr. President, it ought to be obvious to anyone that that neighbor, who himself perhaps has no other means of support than the interest upon that mortgage, who, perhaps, has retired and for the few more years he has to live upon this earth has a little income from this mortgage; certainly he can not be expected to join in the humiliation of the farmer and in effect in his involuntary servitude. Ah, Mr. President, if you so expect, you do not know the American farmer; you misjudge him.

It may be a bank that is the mortgagee. Will that bank take advantage of this ill-advised proposal? Scarcely. If that particular bank holds one or several mortgages, it is inconceivable that it is going to handle the individual cases. I am just analyzing what takes place back in the country among the farmers. No; the bank will go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and obtain a lump sum, or else it will not continue long in business in that agricultural community; at least it will not continue long to have the support of that agricultural community.

If it is an insurance company—a great life-insurance company, or a small life-insurance company, or any character of insurance company—is it conceived for one moment that that insurance company is going to ask these individual farmers to confess their property and certify to their distress? Certainly not. That is inconceivable.

Then I ask, Is it some financial institution, or a building and loan association? While I am speaking of the farmer now, what I have said can be applied as well to the home owner in so far as the bill authorizes him to confess his poverty and his distress. Can any Senator conceive of any financial institutions, building and loan associations, or other similar institutions, asking the individual home owner or the individual farmer to certify to his distress and his poverty? No.

Well, then, let me ask, what other creditor of the farmer or the home owner is going to go through this process? I can conceive of none. I can conceive of no mortgage creditor of the farmer who would ever consent to undertake this kind of a scheme for agricultural relief.

Mr. President, when the bill is analyzed, when it is subjected to consideration of its detailed operation in practical effect, I can come to no other conclusion than that it is a mere pretense, a sham, a deception, and unworthy of the time of Congress to consider its passage or approval.

Mr. President, we hear much complaint in these days about the Congress. I have heard in private conversation and I have heard on the floor of the Senate some strong intimations in severe criticism of the press gallery, of the newspapers of this country, because of their attitude toward the Congress and the criticisms that are made; but I want this afternoon frankly to advise the Senate and the United States that back upon the farms there is almost an entire lack of confidence, not only in the Congress but in government. That lack of confidence arises not through ill will toward democracy, not through ill will toward parties, not through ill will toward Members of the Congress—but that lack of confidence arises because of the repeated deceptions that have been imposed upon the farmers of this country by the Congress and by Presidents and by Cabinets.

I am not surprised that the farmers take the law into their own hands. I am not surprised that they resort to force to protect their homes and their firesides. I am not surprised that they go on strike. I am surprised that they have not gone further in protecting their homes and their firesides. When I suggest that even though their action may involve violence, it involves also a higher law, the right of self-preservation.

Mr. President, this sort of legislation for the farmer has been going on for quite a considerable time. As I said the other day, as I understand, there were some 30 measures, all bearing the robe and cloak of farm relief. To those measures we have added two more—one, the so-called debtors' provision; another, the Hull-Walcott bill; and I think, Mr. President, that I can no better serve the people of my country than to review the last two proposals of farm relief.

Mr. President, I have very inadequately described the Hull-Walcott bill. I have discussed it only from the standpoint of the farmer. It does more than harm to him; it is harmful to the country. It is harmful to the credit of the United States. During the last few months there have been attempts to raid the Treasury of the United States, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and we find the credit of our Government sagging; we find its bonds

falling below par; and if this sort of thing continues for any length of time, the Government of the United States will find itself where it, too, will need to resort to insolvency proceedings. I am not going into that feature of the bill.

I shall take some time to poke a little fun at the so-called farm-relief debtor bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator mean the Hull bill?

Mr. BLAINE. No; the bankruptcy bill for the relief of farmers. I want to point out these matters for this reason: I do not know whether it will receive general consideration by the press, but I want to emphasize that practically every piece of legislation that has been passed under the cloak of being in aid of agriculture to-day finds agriculture deeper and deeper in the mire of distress and debt. Why?

Mr. President, the larger portion of those measures can be characterized only as I have characterized the Hull-Walcott bill. From the standpoint of relief, they were merely bunk. The farmers of the country know that language, and appreciate the force of it, and have expressed it with a greater degree of force than I can express it.

Now, let us look at some more of this bunk—"Relieving the farmer"—"Moratorium"—"Saving his home from foreclosure"—"Saving his home from sheriff's sale." Let us see what some of the proposals are.

No one has pointed out how a single foreclosure is going to be prevented under the Hull-Walcott bill; and, if prevented, nothing has been brought to the attention of the Senate that persuades me that at the end of two years he will be any better off than he is to-day. My own conviction is, as I have pointed out, that the farmer will be in far greater distress, with more debts, more obligations, and a heavier burden to carry.

The Hull-Walcott bill is only one futile method of extending a moratorium to the farmer. I want to point out another scheme, the bankruptcy bill.

Section 77 of the bankruptcy bill provides that courts of bankruptcy are authorized, upon petition of at least 15 farmers within any county who certify that they intend to file petitions under that section, to appoint for such county one or more—now, note—one or more referees to be known as conciliation commissioners.

"Conciliation commissioners"—one or more in each county of the United States!

Well, I can envision what is going to happen. You know, we have a lot of farm leaders in this country. Many of them have been honest, sincere, and determined leaders, men who have not for one moment misled or betrayed their fellow farmers; but we get a new growth of farm leaders every once in a while nearly everywhere. It will be found under this bill that it will be that character of "savior" for the farmer who will be running around in the several counties of the United States with a petition to be signed by 15 farmers, and when he gets that petition signed he will file it with the court of bankruptcy; and immediately, he being the leader of the county, the one man interested in protecting the farmers of the county, he will be appointed conciliation commissioner as a matter of course, because he will have the indorsement of these 15 farmers.

This job is not to be laughed at in these days of unemployment. That is the method by which a conciliation commission is initiated. But, of course, the bill is very careful to provide that no individual shall be eligible to appointment as a conciliation commissioner unless he is eligible for appointment as a referee in addition, and, in addition, is a resident of the county, familiar with agricultural conditions, not engaged in the farm-mortgage business, or the business of financing farmers, or transactions in agricultural commodities, or the business of marketing or dealing in agricultural commodities. It is very careful to provide the qualifications for a conciliation commissioner. But I think the country can be assured that there will be enough gentlemen seeking the jobs who will be able to qualify for the jobs.

Now, what happens? We have the 15 farmers who are all going into this form of bankruptcy. It is said it is not bankruptcy, that this is a debtor section. I can conceive no distinction between an individual who undertakes to discharge his debts under this method and the individual who undertakes to discharge his debts under an ordinary bankruptcy proceeding or through an insolvency proceeding.

It does not make any difference by what name he is called, he is a man who can not pay his debts. He is to be pitied. But they did not want to stigmatize him as a bankrupt, so they call him a debtor. That is a great consolation to the man who is in debt and who is in poverty. It is a great satisfaction, I am sure, Mr. President, to be able to realize the distinction between yourself as a debtor who can not pay his debts and as a bankrupt. It is a fine distinction, but I presume these conciliation commissioners will be able to work out that distinction. I doubt whether the farmer will ever be able to detect it. He is too keen for that, he has too much common sense. He is not imbued with this everlasting overflow of "bunk," and he sees things as they are. He faces the sun as it rises. His eyes are clear, and his mind is honest.

Not only is a conciliation commissioner provided for but the court may appoint a supervising conciliation commissioner, and the importance of this Senators will be able to ascertain a little later in my discourse, or in the debate upon this question.

The supervising conciliation commissioner is to have such functions as the court may by order specify. There is to be a conciliation commissioner appointed, a supervising conciliation commissioner appointed, and now we will ascertain the process.

Upon the filing of any petition by a farmer or creditor under this section there shall be paid a fee of \$10 to the clerk of the court.

That is to go into the Treasury of the United States, I presume. But that is only one ten-dollar bill for each farmer. The conciliation commissioner under this bill will receive for his services, including his expenses, \$10 for each case docketed and submitted to him. That is to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States. Note that the conciliation commissioner will receive \$10 for each of these cases. But that is not all. The supervising conciliation commissioner will receive for his services a per diem allowance, to be fixed by the court, but not in excess of \$5 a day, together with sustenance and travel expenses in accordance with the law applicable to the Department of Justice.

That is, he will get his \$5 a day, he will receive his Pullman fare, his hotel bill, his taxicab fees, his porter charges, and all those other little white metal pieces which he may or may not pay out during his travel in and among the counties of the State. That is all to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

As I understand, under this bill there can be just as many supervising conciliation commissioners as the court desires to select. Let us see just what happens. There are 48 States in the Union. I do not know how many counties there are in the 48 States, but it must run into quite a considerable number—I would assume into the thousands. So we will have the conciliation commissioner for each county, a number of supervising conciliation commissioners, and those gentlemen are to supervise the farmer while the farmer is getting himself out of debt. I will point out how they proceed, how they supervise, the tremendous power they will have. I want to be absolutely accurate.

Note the provision, Mr. President, if the creditors at any time desire supervision over the farming operations of a farmer—this is enough to make a farmer scream—the cost of such supervision shall be borne by the creditors or the farmer. Think of an honest farmer out there in his field having these officials attached to him. While he plows the soil in the spring, and plants his seed, cultivates the corn and the cotton, and harvests the corn and the cotton, here is a supervising conciliation commissioner over here and a supervising conciliation commissioner over there getting \$5 a day and expenses for supervising the farmer.

Do you say that is ridiculous? It is ridiculous, but it is exactly the absurdity of the law and not my characterization of it that makes it ridiculous.

Let us see what else there is:

But in no case shall the farmer pay more than one-half of the cost of this supervision.

That is real relief for the farmer. He is protected to the extent of one-half the cost of these supervisors. This is the bill which the Senate passed not very long ago—just a few days ago.

What can we expect the farmer to think of a Congress which writes into legislation—and I am speaking seriously now—that kind of “bunk”? I am not surprised that a legislative body falls into disrespect when it passes that character of legislation.

Mr. President, that is not all. There are many details of this bill which I can not take the time to discuss. Not being satisfied with bringing the farmer under this section, the exemption of the farmer under the individual-debtor section was taken out by amendment, so that he is brought under the two provisions. Therefore the farmer has three ways in which to go into bankruptcy: First, under the general bankruptcy act, under a voluntary proceeding; second, under the individual-debtor section; third, under the so-called farmer-debtor relief provision.

I am speaking now only of the last method by which he can go into bankruptcy. Unfortunately, however, the third method does not discharge him from his debts. That is the unfortunate situation, perhaps, a farmer may face. I shall confine my discussion to this one method.

The bill provides that not more than half of the cost of supervision shall be charged against the farmer. I do not know who drafted this bill, but very shortly after the provision splitting the costs 50-50 it seeks to protect him from all the charges in these conciliation-commissioner cases. That is a wise provision. He will get the supervision of the conciliation commissioner and the supervising conciliation commissioner without paying anything for it, unless he agrees to pay one-half of the cost; but the Government says he must not pay more than one-half of the cost for that supervision. That is very generous to him.

The Supreme Court of the United States, under this act, will have to take a course in agriculture. I can not see any escape from that.

This great court, on the bench of which, of course, there are no farmers, is to issue general orders to govern the administration of the office of conciliation commissioner. Here is a conciliation commissioner over in Posey County or some other county, and this great judicial organization must prescribe rules for the conduct of his office. Mr. President, a mere recital of the bill without any expression of opinion must convince anyone that its provisions are perfectly ludicrous, silly, ridiculous.

After five years, thanks to something or somebody, there will come an end to the conciliation commissioner and the supervising conciliation commissioner. By that time the law will have expired by its own terms unless another Congress renews or extends it. That is one redeeming feature about it. But let us examine briefly what may be done within those five years.

A petition may be filed by any farmer or by any creditor of such farmer. Do not worry about the farmer's part of it. He probably will not bother himself about this act excepting to obey the subpoena and order of the court. A petition may be filed by any creditor of a farmer stating that the farmer is insolvent—that is, bankrupt—and unable to meet his debts, and that it is desirable to effect a compromise or an extension of time to pay his debts. The purpose of the bill, I assume, is to bring about a composition of debts or to bring about an extension of the time within which to pay the debts. The first undertaking would be a laudable one, but does anyone think for a moment that the creditors of a farmer, who are usually the local merchants, the local implement dealers, perhaps the local doctor, possibly a note at the bank—those are about the only creditors the farmer has—does anyone assume that creditors of that character

are going to compromise any more quickly or expeditiously under a conciliation commissioner than they would voluntarily? Common sense leads us to a conclusion with respect to that matter. The character of creditors of the farmer is such that they would compromise without having this tin-pan county conciliation commissioner intervening.

But that is the purpose exactly. We can come to the same conclusion respecting the extension of time for the payment of the farmer's debts. I am not complaining about that, but let us see what we have to go through. Let us see the processes through which the farmer must go before there is any possibility of composition or an extension of the terms for the payment of the debts.

He must answer. Then he must file an inventory of his estate. The bill enshrouds the farmer with a great deal of protection, saying that no attorney shall be necessary to appear in his behalf. When the farmer confronts this petition, when he must file a schedule and inventory, when he is subpoenaed to go to court to be examined, I dare say that he will never escape the necessity of consulting a lawyer. It is not what the bill says he may not require. It will be what the farmer in his own mind believes to be for his own best interests and protection.

Then he must file an inventory of his estate. I do not know why the drafters of the bill did not say his debts instead of an inventory of his estate. One would think he was a millionaire living up on the Hudson River in his grand estate. But he has to file an inventory of this country estate of his. Then he is marched off to court. He is subpoenaed. In my own State he will be required in some cases to travel nearly 400 miles before he can get to court. The railroad fare is \$3.60 or \$3.80 for each and every hundred miles, and in addition he will have to pay his overnight hotel bills; but when he is commanded he must go to court and be examined.

The creditors, being somewhat suspicious of the farmer, then appoint a committee to submit to the conciliation commissioner a supplementary inventory of the farmer's estate. Why, Mr. President, the bill must have been drawn by somebody who lives on Fifth Avenue and practices law in the twenty-third story of a Wall Street office building, but whose knowledge of agriculture would seem to indicate that he might have obtained it when he visited a menagerie or the zoo, where he probably had seen a sacred ox. There is to be this inventory of the farmer's estate and a supplementary inventory of the farmer's estate. Then the proceedings are gone through, and the conciliation commissioner, who has general supervision, as I shall point out, fixes the time within which application for confirmation shall be made, and then various other proceedings follow.

Let me point out that after the filing of the petition and prior to the confirmation or any other disposition of the composition or extension proposal by the court, the court is empowered to “exercise such control over the property of the farmer as the court deems in the best interest of the farmer and his creditors.” Read that to a farmer who is in debt. Just read that one sentence in the bill to a farmer who is burdened with debt and get his opinion of this character of legislation. The court is to exercise such control over the property of the farmer as the court deems to be the best interest of the farmer and his creditors. Why, Mr. President, before I succeeded in having an amendment adopted to the bill providing for his exemptions and allowances, the bill as originally drafted, apparently drafted by some one who knows nothing about agriculture or agricultural conditions, would have placed under the control of the court every stitch of his clothing, every article of his personal property, and the homestead of the farmer as well.

Mr. President, the point I make respecting that is that those who drafted and initiated this legislation were not thinking about the farmer. The supervision by the court is not exclusive. I should qualify that. From the standpoint of the rule of law the court's control is exclusive, but the bill gives additional control or other control or supplemental control over the farmer's property to another official, and I shall now turn to that paragraph of the bill.

I do not have the original draft of the bill before me so I can not give the reference, but I believe it is under subdivision or subsection (h).

Under that paragraph the composition or extension proposal—

may also include specific undertakings by the debtor during the period of the extension, including provision for payments on account, and may provide—

This is the control feature—

for supervisory or other control by the conciliation commissioner over the farmers' affairs.

They are bound to get the farmer controlled; first, by the courts without his consent; second, by the conciliation commissioner with his consent; and, third—the control has not yet ceased; after this general control by the courts, and after this supervisory or other control; whatever that is nobody knows—there is to be "supervisory control and other control" over the farmers' affairs. Then, to tie this thing down, to nail it down, to clinch the nails, and be certain that the farmer would be under complete and absolute protection and guardianship, there is a provision in the bill giving blanket control to the court. I will read that paragraph. It is subdivision (n)—

The filing of a debtor's petition or answer seeking relief under this section shall—

Remember now that the filing of a petition for relief—that is, a petition by the creditor, a petition by the man to whom the farmer owes money—the filing of a petition by that man subjects the farmer—

and his property, wherever located, to the exclusive jurisdiction of the court.

Ah, they were certain to protect and aid the farmer!

Mr. President, the general bankruptcy law was a very carefully and intelligently drafted proposal. A great deal of time was taken in the drafting and consideration of that law. We do not find any such silly provisions in that law. A farmer may come under that law voluntarily if he so desires; but when the creditor of the farmer once files a petition under this proposed law, the farmer has no other course which he can follow, and no other proceeding which he may undertake. He is hog-tied by this proposed legislation which is going to become a law, as I understand, even as soon as this afternoon.

Mr. President, I presume I should have discussed this bill before it passed. I have no other excuse to make than that I was unable to be in the Chamber at that time for reasons that are well known to many of the Senators. I did not have the opportunity. So I do not regard it as unfair to the Senate, under the circumstances, to criticize this bill, as I think it justly deserves criticism.

So, Mr. President, under the original draft of this bill, without the amendment which I submitted and which was adopted, protecting the farmer as to his exemptions and allowances, the court would have had exclusive jurisdiction not only of the farmer but also of all his property. The filing of the petition pleading for relief under this section shall subject the farmer and his property wherever located to the exclusive jurisdiction of the court.

The farmer is to be subjected to these tender mercies. What does that provision mean in law? It is a double-barreled proposition. First, it subjects the farmer to the exclusive jurisdiction of the court, and that means the person of the farmer; that means the farmer's household; that means his wife; that means his children; that means his hired man; that means the help upon the farm—the control of the farmer. So it may be possible for the court, under that broad power, to put the farmer in servitude during the period for the consideration of the composition. That may be a year, it may be two years, it may be five years under this bill, and there would be no escape from it.

Under the present bankruptcy law the farmer may file his petition in a voluntary proceeding, select his exemptions, his personal property, his homestead, abandon all the rest of his property, and make himself free from the very moment that there has been an adjudication of bankruptcy.

It is not so under this proposed law. He is tied down to a servitude so long as his creditors may persuade the court that there is an opportunity for them to drain from him the last drop of blood, to extract from him the last ounce of energy, to take from him and his family every opportunity of freedom of choice. That is the legal effect of that provision.

Whether or not the Supreme Court of the United States would sustain it, I do not know; but our Supreme Court, as I recall, has said that under the broad power of enacting uniform bankruptcy laws the Congress might even provide death as a penalty for the violation of the law. This proposed legislation must be sustained, if it shall be sustained at all, upon the theory that Congress is legislating under the power to enact uniform laws on bankruptcy. Therefore, exercising that power, and under the power conferred upon the court by subdivision (n), the court could command the farmer to stay upon his farm, to cultivate that farm, and do any act in connection with the conduct of that farm that might be prescribed by the court. The farmer's failure to obey would mean punishment for contempt, and that would mean a jail sentence. Yet that is the kind of a law, that is the kind of an act, that was proposed in the Senate and passed by the Senate.

What I have said has reference to the person of the farmer. The provision to which I have alluded, of course, would authorize a court in imposing involuntary servitude upon the farmer by way of punishment for the violation of an order of the court.

Do not mistake what may be done under this provision. The power is there, and the power once possessed by a court is usually exercised by a court. Make no mistake about that, either.

That is the person of the farmer; and, of course, that will go to his family so far as the farmer exercises control over his household. That means his children under 21 years of age. That means that those who are in his employment must obey, or they may be subjected to the penalty for disobedience.

Now, the control of his property: I will repeat the provision—

The filing of a petition pleading for relief under this section shall subject the farmer and his property, wherever located, to the exclusive jurisdiction of the court.

If the House does not strike out the amendment which I offered, and which was adopted here, protecting the farmer in his right to his exemptions and allowances, there is some protection left to the farmer. If the House should fail to concur in that amendment, Mr. President, then the legal effect of this provision is that every piece of property, personal and real, belonging to the farmer or belonging to his family, will be under the control of the court. There never has been, in the history of the United States, the enactment of legislation of this kind that has gone so far to jeopardize the personal rights and the property rights of any single class in this country as does this bill; and yet this bill is paraded as aid to agriculture, while denying to the farmer his elementary constitutional rights!

Then, Mr. President, the leader on the Democratic side pleads with me not to disturb the Hull-Walcott bill, to give it a chance to be passed in the House. Let us not consider legislation that is of particular relief to the farmer, that goes to the root of his problem, that will discharge his debts, that will permit him to unload that burden of debt, is in effect his plea.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate and the Congress might better turn their attention to other things than these temporary measures. Oh, I understand that they are designed by Senators honestly. They believe that they will serve the public; but I think it has been demonstrated now for a year and more that every piece of emergency legislation that has been enacted has driven us deeper and deeper and wider into this depression.

We have proposed here a Reconstruction Finance Corporation that was to save the banks; and in this country to-day there are four or five States where the governors of

the States have closed the banks. There has arisen a condition where this Congress has authorized the Comptroller of the Currency, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to close every national bank in every State where the same power may be exercised by the State.

Mr. President, I need not review these failures; but these failures ought to be a warning to the Senate that we can not continue this kind of legislation without destroying the confidence of the people in their Government and eventually destroying this Government. Let me frankly say, Mr. President, that a government that can not respond to the demands of our people to save them, their homes, and their property is not worth preserving. If that be treason, make the most of it.

Then, Mr. President, notwithstanding that, great party leaders will plead here that we should not reconsider the bill to which I directed my attention at the beginning of this debate.

Mr. President, it has not been my purpose during this session of the Congress to delay the Congress in any respect. I think the Members on both sides will concur in the statement that so far as I have been able personally to facilitate the carrying on of the business of the Senate, I have made every effort to expedite action in the Senate. I do not intend at this late hour to delay action upon any proposition; but I felt that I owed a duty to the men and women upon the farms, among whom I have lived a lifetime, whom I love, whom I respect. That duty that I owed to them was to challenge the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the United States in their onward rush of deceiving the farmers of my country.

So, Mr. President, if I may be able to obtain a favorable vote when I make the motion to reconsider the Hull-Walcott bill, I shall offer as an amendment bill S. 5640, not a bill designed to postpone any debt, not a bill to create a new class of debtors, not a bill to heap interest upon interest, and defaults upon defaults, and compounded interest thereon, but a bill designed to reconstruct the capital structure of agriculture and to advance funds at a rate of interest that agriculture can pay.

I have reviewed very briefly the provisions of the bill which I shall offer as an amendment. I do not care to prolong the debate further, as it will be but a few moments when I shall be required to leave the Chamber again for the evening. So, Mr. President, I trust that we may proceed with the regular order, and perhaps to-morrow morning we can take up the question of a reconsideration of the Hull-Walcott bill, and then a consideration of the amendment which I shall propose.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Has the Senator from Wisconsin made his motion to reconsider?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator has simply given notice that he will file a motion to reconsider.

Mr. CLARK. Then, Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Hull-Walcott bill was passed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. BLAINE. I desire to make an inquiry of the Senator from Arkansas. Does the Senator from Arkansas assume that that parliamentary procedure is going to expedite the business of the Senate during the balance of the session?

Mr. President, I understand that the motion is not debatable. I will make my comment afterward.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, in view of the extraordinary haste and the very unusual attitude that has been exhibited on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, I desire to serve

notice that from now on, as long as I can be present in the Senate Chamber, no other Senator shall be denied the opportunity to which in good conscience he is entitled.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14643) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee on page 2, which has already been stated.

Mr. KING. I ask to have the amendment restated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be restated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 6, after the word "addition," it is proposed to strike out "\$6,500,000" and insert "\$9,500,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

That in order to defray the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, any revenue (not including the proportionate share of the United States in any revenue arising as the result of the expenditure of appropriations made for the fiscal year 1924 and prior fiscal years) now required by law to be credited to the District of Columbia and the United States in the same proportion that each contributed to the activity or source from whence such revenue was derived shall be credited wholly to the District of Columbia, and, in addition, \$9,500,000 is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be advanced July 1, 1933, and all the remainder out of the combined revenues of the District of Columbia, namely:

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not intend to consume more than a minute.

I am very much opposed to this amendment, increasing the Federal appropriation for the District of Columbia from \$6,500,000 to \$9,500,000. I think that the District of Columbia, which is in better financial condition than any other part of the United States, with lower taxes than any other section of the United States, ought not to impose upon the Federal Government and upon the taxpayers of the United States this additional burden.

The appropriation carried in the bill as it came from the House I regard as liberal and entirely just and adequate; and I am opposed to taxing the people of the United States further in order to relieve the people of the District of Columbia from taxation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was under the heading "General expenses, Executive Office," on page 3, line 18, after the word "services," to strike out "\$105,520" and insert "\$134,070," so as to read:

Building inspection division: For personal services, \$134,070;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 20, after the word "services," to strike out "\$35,600" and insert "\$36,920," and in line 21, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$35,900" and insert "\$37,220," so as to read:

Plumbing inspection division: For personal services, \$36,920; two members of plumbing board, at \$150 each; in all, \$37,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Care of District Building," on page 4, line 3, after the word "labor," to strike out "\$76,860" and insert "\$79,710," and in line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$91,860" and insert "\$94,710," so as to read:

For personal services, including temporary labor, \$79,710; service of cleaners as necessary, not to exceed 48 cents per hour, \$15,000; in all \$94,710:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of superintendent of weights, measures, and markets," on page 5, line 17, to increase the appropriation for maintenance and repairs to markets from \$7,000 to \$7,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Municipal architect's office," on page 6, line 2, after the word "services," to strike out "\$60,700" and insert "\$66,000, including not to exceed \$1,500 for employment of engineering or other professional services, by contract or otherwise, and without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) or the classification act of 1923, as amended," so as to read:

For personal services, \$66,000, including not to exceed \$1,500 for employment of engineering or other professional services, by contract or otherwise, and without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) or the classification act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to register my disapproval of this amendment. I see no reason for augmenting the very liberal appropriation carried in the measure as it came from the House. No explanation has been given to justify this increased appropriation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Utilities Commission," on page 6, line 17, after the word "services," to strike out "\$37,565" and insert "\$39,400," so as to read:

For two commissioners, people's counsel, and for other personal services, \$39,400, of which amount not to exceed \$5,000 may be used for the employment of expert services by contract or otherwise and without reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, on page 6, I move to strike out, on line 17, "\$39,400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$92,837."

Then on the same page, line 20, after the words "as amended," I move to strike out the period and insert a comma and the words "and of which amount not to exceed \$688 shall be immediately available."

This would provide for obtaining additional information on housing in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 17, to strike out "\$39,400" and insert "\$92,837," and on line 20 to strike out the period and insert a comma and the words "and of which amount not to exceed \$688 shall be immediately available," so as to read:

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

For two commissioners, people's counsel, and for other personal services, \$92,837, of which amount not to exceed \$5,000 may be used for the employment of expert services by contract or otherwise and without reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended, and of which amount not to exceed \$688 shall be immediately available.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 23, to strike out—

No part of the appropriations contained in this act shall be used for or in connection with the preparation, issuance, publication, or enforcement of any regulation or order of the Public Utilities Commission requiring the installation of meters in taxicabs: *Provided*, That this prohibition shall not be construed to affect any order or part of an order of such Public Utilities Commission other than with respect to the requirement of the installation of such meters.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

No part of the appropriations contained in this act shall be used for or in connection with the preparation, issuance, publication, or enforcement of any regulation or order of the Public Utilities Commission requiring the installation of meters in taxicabs if the initial rate exceeds 25 cents for the first 2 miles, or portion thereof, and 10 cents a mile thereafter: *Provided*, That this prohibition shall not be construed to affect any order or part of an order of such Public Utilities Commission other than with respect to the requirement of the installation of such meters.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to amend the committee amendment by striking out, on page 7, lines 7 to 16.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of vehicles and traffic," on page 9, line 2, to increase the appropriation for personal services from \$68,320 to \$73,780.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 7, after the word "commissioners," to strike out "\$63,200" and insert "\$77,640," so as to read:

For purchase, installation, and modification of electric traffic lights, signals and controls, markers, painting white lines, labor, maintenance of nonpassenger-carrying motor vehicles and such other expenses as may be necessary in the judgment of the commissioners, \$77,640:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Register of wills," on page 10, line 14, to increase the appropriation for personal services in the office of register of wills from \$60,000 to \$68,490.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, is there any reason for increasing the appropriation for the Register of Wills?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, several representatives of the bar association of the District of Columbia, and various other associations of lawyers of the District, appeared before us and urged that this amendment be made. The office is self-supporting, and in order to maintain the office as an efficient organization, it will be necessary to have this increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 21, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "\$8,000" and insert "\$10,000," so as to read:

For miscellaneous and contingent expenses, telephone bills, printing, typewriters, photostat paper and supplies, including laboratory coats and photographic developing room equipment, towels, towel service, window washing, street-car tokens, furniture and equipment and repairs thereto, and purchase of books of reference, law books, and periodicals, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Recorder of deeds," on page 10, line 23, after the word "services," to strike out "\$48,585, including recopying or photostating old land records of the District of Columbia," and insert "\$97,170, of which \$6,000 shall be available only for recopying old land records of the District of Columbia," so as to read:

For personal services, \$97,170, of which \$6,000 shall be available only for recopying old land records of the District of Columbia.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, is there any justification for doubling the appropriation for the recorder of deeds?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, for some reason unknown to us the House cut the appropriation recommended by the Budget in half, and at the earnest request of the Democratic members of the Committee on Appropriations the appropriation was put back at the figures recommended by the Budget.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator what the appropriation for this office last year was?

Mr. BINGHAM. The appropriation for last year was \$97,170, with the legislative furlough taken out, and the Budget recommended the same amount this year.

The Senator may remember that I spoke to him about the necessity of getting through Congress legislation permitting the recorder of deeds to charge proper fees, so that the office would be self-supporting. In the opinion of the committee, there is no necessity for this office being a burden on the taxpayers, since the services rendered should be paid for. I think the Senator agreed with me, and agreed that as soon as possible in the new Congress legislation would be suggested providing for fees in this office which would make it self-supporting. If the provision inserted in the bill in the House were left in it, the recorder of deeds would have to discharge half the clerks in that office.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator that there is no defense for imposing upon the taxpayers the cost of main-

taining this office. Those who have deeds and other legal instruments recorded ought to be compelled to pay for the recording, and I assumed that had been the case. I shall not object, in view of the fact that legislation will be necessary in order to compel the establishment of the fee system for recording deeds and other legal instruments.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, may I ask whether or not any fees are charged at the present time in this office?

Mr. BINGHAM. Fees are charged, but they are very inadequate, less than in any other city.

Mr. TRAMMELL. The suggestion of fees always provokes a question of doubt in my mind. I have seldom known of the instance of a city or county—and I presume the same thing is true in the District of Columbia—where the fees, instead of not being adequate, as a rule are not excessive. It is possible they charge about all the fees they can charge, and all the freight the traffic will bear at present, and that is the reason why they do not increase the fees. I always look with a good deal of suspicion on the idea of increasing fees.

Do the fees from this office go into the Treasury or go to some officer?

Mr. BINGHAM. The fees are covered into the Treasury.

Mr. TRAMMELL. They are all covered into the Treasury?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes. But the fees at present are only 50 cents for the first 200 words. Even in the small village in which I live in Connecticut the fee for recording a small deed is 75 cents, where there is very little to be done; but in the District of Columbia the fee is only 50 cents for the first 200 words, and only 15 cents for each additional hundred words. The Senator will realize that is not an adequate charge; and the bill proposed, which I trust may some day be passed, would provide for a fee of \$1 for the first 200 words.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Probably the existing fees are a little low. I know, however, that in localities not nearly so large and extensive in population and in transfers of property and litigation as the District of Columbia, the fees in total amount are enormous, but the rate is not very much above that charged here. I do not imagine the rate would be very much above what it is to maintain the office without calling on the Government to supplement the funds, as is the case at the present time. I think the office ought to be self-sustaining, but I do not believe there is any justification for any very great increase in the fees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 11, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$12,000," so as to read:

For miscellaneous and contingent expenses, including telephone service, printing, binding, rebinding, repairing, and preservation of records; typewriters, towels, towel service, furniture and equipment and repairs thereto; books of reference, law books and periodicals, street-car tokens, postage, not exceeding \$100 for rest room for sick and injured employees and the equipment of and medical supplies for said rest room, and all other necessary incidental expenses, \$12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses," on page 11, line 19, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$3,000," and on page 12, line 3, after the word "officer," to strike out "\$27,000" and insert "\$31,000," so as to read:

For checks, books, law books, books of reference, periodicals, newspapers, stationery; surveying instruments and implements; drawing materials; binding, rebinding, repairing, and preservation of records; ice; repairs to pound and vehicles, not to exceed \$500; traveling expenses not to exceed \$3,000, including payment of dues and traveling expenses in attending conventions when authorized by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; expenses authorized by law in connection with the removal of dangerous or unsafe and insanitary buildings, including payment of a fee of \$6 per diem to each member of board of survey, other than the inspector of buildings, while actually employed on surveys of dangerous or unsafe buildings; and other general necessary expenses of District offices; \$31,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 10, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$55,875" and insert "\$65,000," so as to read:

For printing and binding, including the printing of the report on the power needs of the District of Columbia, \$65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 16, after the word "ambulances," to insert "and except as otherwise specifically authorized in this act," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That no passenger-carrying automobile, except busses, patrol wagons, and ambulances, and except as otherwise specifically authorized in this act, shall be acquired under any provision of this act, by purchase or exchange at a cost, including the value of a vehicle exchanged, exceeding \$650. No motor vehicles shall be transferred from the police or fire departments to any other branch of the government of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to:

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Employment service," on page 16, line 6, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$10,207" and insert "\$10,950," so as to read:

For personal services and miscellaneous and contingent expenses required for maintaining a public employment service for the District of Columbia, \$10,950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Street and road improvement and repair," on page 17, line 7, after the word "services," to strike out "\$176,990" and insert "\$189,680," so as to read:

Salaries, highways department: For personal services, \$189,680.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 16, after the word "vehicles," to strike out "\$199,030" and insert "\$224,030," so as to read:

For assessment and permit work, paving of roadways under the permit system, and construction and repair of sidewalks and curbs around public reservations and municipal and United States buildings, including purchase or condemnation of streets, roads, and alleys, and of areas less than 250 square feet at the intersection of streets, avenues, or roads in the District of Columbia, to be selected by the commissioners, and including maintenance of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles, \$224,030.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Gasoline tax, road and street improvements and repairs," on page 19, after line 4, to insert:

Northwest: Oliver Street, Broad Branch Road to Nevada Avenue, \$6,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 6, to insert:

Northwest: Nevada Avenue, Nebraska Avenue to Thirty-sixth Street, \$7,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 8, to insert:

Northwest: Forty-sixth Street, Fessenden Street to Davenport Street, \$10,350.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 10, to insert:

Northwest: Davenport Street, Forty-sixth Street to Forty-seventh Street, \$6,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 12, to insert:

Northwest: Elliott Street, Forty-sixth Street to Forty-seventh Street, \$6,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 14, to insert:

Northwest: Forty-ninth Street, Albemarle Street to Chesapeake Street, \$12,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 16, to insert:

Northwest: Forty-ninth Street, Massachusetts Avenue to Albe-marle Street, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 18, to insert:

Northwest: Walbridge Place, Park Road to Adams Mill Road, \$6,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 20, to insert:

Northwest: Twelfth Street, Rittenhouse Street to Sheridan Street, \$5,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 22, to insert:

Northwest: Twenty-sixth Street, Virginia Avenue to New Hamp-shire Avenue, \$9,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 20, to insert:

Northwest: Sixteenth Street, Columbia Road to Tiger Bridge, \$105,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to reject this amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 2, to insert:

Northwest: Rittenhouse Street, Georgia Avenue to Twelfth Street, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 4, to insert:

Southeast: Park Place, Twenty-fifth Street to approximately 300 feet east, \$2,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 6, to insert:

Southeast: Palmer Place, Twenty-fifth Street to approximately 350 feet east, \$3,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 8, to insert:

Northeast: Twenty-third Place, E Street to approximately 300 feet south, \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 10, to insert:

Northeast: E Street, Twenty-third Place to alley east of Twenty-fourth Street, \$5,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 12, to insert:

Northwest: Seventh Street, Nicholson Street to Oglethorpe Street, \$2,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 14, to insert:

Northwest: Nicholson Street, Sixth Street to Seventh Street, \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 16, to insert:

Northwest: Longfellow Street, Second Street to Third Street, \$8,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 18, to insert:

Northwest: Tuckerman Street, Second Place to Third Street, \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 20, to insert:

Northwest: Tuckerman Street, Eighth Street to Ninth Street, \$5,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 22, to insert:

Northwest: Dahlia Street, Georgia Avenue to Ninth Street, \$2,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 21, to insert:

Northwest: Eighth Street, Aspen Street to Butternut Street, \$4,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 2, to insert:

Northwest: Ninth Street, Aspen Street to Butternut Street, \$4,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 4, to insert:

Northeast: Randolph Street, Bladensburg Road to Twenty-fourth Street, \$11,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 6, to insert:

Southeast: First Street, N to O Streets, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 7, to insert:

Southeast: O Street, First Street to Second Street, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 9, to insert:

Southeast: Second Street, N Street to O Street, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 10, to insert:

Northwest: Reservoir Road, Foxhall Road to Conduit Road, \$42,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 12, to insert:

Northwest: Thirty-first Street, Chesapeake and Ohio Canal to K Street and South Street, Thirty-first Street to Wisconsin Avenue, \$7,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 15, to insert:

Northwest: Conduit Road, Reservoir Road to District line, \$194,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 17, to insert:

Southeast: Good Hope Road, Minnesota Avenue to Alabama Avenue, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 19, to insert:

Northwest: Grading Porter Street, from Connecticut Avenue to Klinge Road, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 21, to insert:

P Street Bridge: For the construction of a bridge to replace the existing bridge in line of P Street over Rock Creek in accordance with plans and profile of said work to be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, including construction of and changes in sewer and water mains, employment of engineering or other professional services, by contract or otherwise, and without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) or the classification act of 1923, as amended, and

engineering and incidental expenses, \$250,000: *Provided*, That any street-railway company using said bridge shall install thereon at its own expense an approved standard underground trolley system of street-car propulsion, and at its own expense shall thereafter maintain such underground construction and bear the cost of surfacing, resurfacing, and maintaining in good condition the space between the railway tracks and 2 feet exterior thereto as provided by law: *Provided further*, That if the Washington Railway & Electric Co. desires to maintain street-car operation during the construction of the bridge, the said company will construct and maintain at its expense a detour trestle constructed in accordance with plans approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and at such time as they may be directed to do so.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 9, after the word "necessary," to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$290,000," so as to read:

For construction of curbs and gutters, or concrete shoulders in connection with all forms of macadam roadways and adjustment of roadways thereto, together with resurfacing and replacing of base of such roadways where necessary, \$290,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 12, after the word "material," to strike out "\$450,000" and insert "\$550,000," so as to read:

For the surfacing and resurfacing or replacement of asphalt, granite block, or concrete pavements with the same or other approved material, \$550,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not move to strike out any of these other items under the head of "Street improvements," but I may state that I have had many complaints during the past few days about some of these so-called extensions and improvements. May I say that in going over the city it has been my opinion that many streets that have adequate pavements are resurfaced and repaved at an expense that is wholly unnecessary. I do not agree with many of the activities and the so-called improvements of those who are looking after the streets. I think there are too many streets that are paved which ought not to be paved, and too many improvements when improvements are not needed. I shall certainly urge the Committee on the District of Columbia, in the future, to pay more attention to the streets, and to prevent many of these activities which I regard as extravagancies and abuses in the paving of the streets of Washington.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, while we are speaking of this matter of streets, I may say that it has been my observation that many of the streets here in Washington deteriorate very rapidly, indicating either poor construction or improper construction or excessively bad climatic conditions, which cause the streets to deteriorate very rapidly here.

If I did not occasionally visit other cities where there are about similar climatic conditions, I might charitably attribute the condition of the streets to the climatic conditions; but, finding that the streets in other places seem to hold up better and seem to be more evenly laid and constructed than in Washington, I sometimes wonder why it is that they have such bad success in constructing streets here and why it is the streets do not endure longer than they do.

It seems to me that it would be wise for those in charge of street construction in the city of Washington to see that the streets are built according to proper specifications and that there is absolute fulfillment of the requirements of the contracts, if that is not true to-day.

The matter of road construction in the District is one where there have been all kinds of opportunities for neglect and slighting of compliance with requirements to make first-class streets that have some endurance. I have seen streets that were paved in Washington which in 2 or 3 or 4 years would go bad. It is very seldom that we find a street paved in Washington that is not full of waves, even newly paved streets. It seems there is something wrong with the street paving in Washington.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I supplement what the Senator has said, and I am associating myself with him in general in his observations. I can not approve and shall vote against

this enormous increase from \$1,741,350 to \$2,849,350 under the head of street improvements.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Utah that this money all comes out of the gasoline-tax fund? It is collected from the users of automobiles for the purpose of keeping the District streets in repair. If it had not been that there was plenty of money in the gasoline-tax fund to do it, the committee would not have approved it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think a proper and adequate reply to the comment of the Senator from Connecticut would be that if the gasoline tax is too high it should be lowered, or if we are collecting more from the gasoline tax than can providently be expended in street improvement, we should amend the law and devote a part of that tax fund to relieving the homes and personal property of our citizens from taxation.

I believe that there have been rather injudicious expenditures on the streets in Washington during the past few years. The complaint made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] is one which has been brought to my attention not once but a thousand times during the past two or three years. When I ride over the streets I find conditions which justify the Senator from Florida in making the complaint. I think there ought to be some changes in the organization that deals with our streets here. I believe that merely because we have a large fountain from which to draw, namely, the gasoline tax, we are not justified in expending it in this extravagant way. If there is too much collected, let us lower the tax or put the money in the Treasury and use it to relieve home owners of the burden of taxation which is upon them.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I do not know personally any of the District Commissioners or any of those occupying higher positions of responsibility in the District government, but I sometimes think that those who administer the affairs of the city, a city of approximately 600,000 population, have very little regard for the public interests.

A few moments ago the Senate adopted an amendment dealing with taxicab meters. Every time we have had an issue come before the Congress relative to the question of taxicabs, the charges to be made, and the rules and regulations which are to be imposed on those who operate taxicabs, I have noticed that the city officials invariably align themselves with a large taxicab company in the city, which everybody knows—whether the commissioners do or not—has tried for years to monopolize the taxicab business of the city of Washington.

About a year ago an outrageous proposition was made. The commissioners adopted the policy of requiring every taxicab to operate with a meter and to operate at certain rates, while most of the men engaged in the operation of taxicabs thought the rates then existing were all right and practically all of them had abandoned the use of meters. Many of the men who represent the independent taxicab operators and companies had never had any meters whatever. The result of the order issued by the commissioners was to require the installation of taxicab meters. They also increased the license tax for tags for taxicabs. A great majority of the men operating taxicabs in the city of Washington own their own cars or have bought them on credit or else have leased them. They had this additional increased tax imposed upon them and also the necessity of the cost of installing meters. The imposition was sufficient, although it has not yet been enforced through the courts, to drive a number of energetic, worthy, deserving men out of their jobs where they were trying to make a living in an honest way.

I can not understand the purpose of such a move on the part of the commissioners, except that it was to try to assist this big taxicab company, which has always insisted on high rates for taxicab service, which has always wanted meters and insisted upon every requirement on the part of the commissioners that would make it more difficult for the poor man without any means of any consequence to engage in the taxicab business. Of course, everybody knows it is not in

the public interest to have regulations that would increase taxicab rates 40 to 75 per cent.

I was very much in sympathy with the action of the House when they prohibited the using of this fund for the purpose of increasing taxicab rates and requiring taxicab owners to install meters. That, in my opinion, would have been a very decided advantage to the one large taxicab company operating in the city, and would at once have succeeded in driving from an honest employment and vocation hundreds of taxicab drivers in the city who either own their own cars or operate in a mutual cooperative association. So far as I am concerned, I am very much in favor of the House provision, and regret very much that the Senate struck out that limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 23, line 16, after the name "Highway Bridge," to insert "and not to exceed \$10,000 for surveys, engineering investigations, and preparation of plans for a viaduct or bridge in the line of New Hampshire Avenue over the tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad," and in line 21, after the word "vehicles," to strike out "\$87,500" and insert "\$122,500," so as to read:

For construction, maintenance, operation, and repair of bridges, including \$45,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for replacement of the fender pile system of the Highway Bridge, and not to exceed \$10,000 for surveys, engineering investigations, and preparation of plans for a viaduct or bridge in the line of New Hampshire Avenue over the tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, and including maintenance of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles, \$122,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 1, after the word "work," to strike out "\$750,000" and insert "\$840,000," so as to read:

For current work of repairs to streets, avenues, roads, and alleys, including the reconditioning of existing gravel streets and roads, and including the purchase, exchange, maintenance, and operation of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles used in this work, \$840,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 5, after the figures "\$30,000," to insert a comma and the following: "and the commissioners, under such conditions as they may prescribe, are further authorized to utilize the existing testing laboratory of the highways department for making tests of all materials for other departments and activities of the District government," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, should they deem such action to be to the advantage of the District of Columbia, are hereby authorized to purchase a municipal asphalt plant at a cost not to exceed \$30,000, and the commissioners, under such conditions as they may prescribe, are further authorized to utilize the existing testing laboratory of the highways department for making tests of all materials for other departments and activities of the District government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 19, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$1,741,350" and insert "\$2,849,350," so as to read:

In all, not to exceed \$2,849,350, to be immediately available; to be disbursed and accounted for as "Gasoline tax, road and street improvements and repairs," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous road and street improvements and repairs," on page 25, line 19, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the amount expended hereunder shall not exceed \$250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 15, to strike out:

No part of the appropriations contained in this act shall be used for the operation of a testing laboratory of the highways department for making tests of materials in connection with any activity of the District government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 9, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$625,000," and in line 11, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$750,000" and insert "\$1,250,000," so as to read:

Calvert Street Bridge over Rock Creek Park: For construction of a bridge to replace the Calvert Street Bridge over Rock Creek, including necessary changes in water and sewer mains, and including the employment of engineering or other professional services, by contract or otherwise, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), or the classification act of 1923, as amended, and engineering and incidental expenses, \$625,000, and the commissioners are authorized to enter into contract or contracts for construction of said bridge at a cost not to exceed \$1,250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Trees and parkings," on page 29, line 11, after the word "items," to strike out "\$81,600" and insert "\$102,000," so as to read:

For contingent expenses, including laborers, trimmers, nurserymen, repairmen, teamsters, hire of carts, wagons, or motor trucks, trees, tree boxes, tree stakes, tree straps, tree labels, planting and care of trees on city and suburban streets, care of trees, tree spaces, purchase and maintenance of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles, and miscellaneous items, \$102,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Sewers," on page 29, line 23, after the word "work," to strike out "\$206,863" and insert "\$226,000," so as to read:

For cleaning and repairing sewers and basins, including the replacement of the following motor trucks: One at not to exceed \$650; one at not to exceed \$750; one at not to exceed \$2,000; for operation and maintenance of the sewage pumping service, including repairs to boilers, machinery, and pumping stations, and employment of mechanics and laborers, purchase of coal, oil, waste, and other supplies, and for the maintenance of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles used in this work, \$226,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 25, after the word "basins," to strike out "\$159,400" and insert "\$192,000," so as to read:

For main and pipe sewers and receiving basins, \$192,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 4, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$2,000; \$368,200" and insert "\$3,500; \$494,500," so as to read:

For suburban sewers, including the maintenance of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles used in this work, and the replacement of the following motor trucks: Three at not to exceed \$650 each; one at not to exceed \$3,500; \$494,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 11, to insert:

For the control and prevention of the spread of mosquitoes in the District of Columbia, including personal services, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, purchase of oil, and other necessary expenses, \$28,800: *Provided*, That such mosquito control and prevention work as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may deem necessary in the areas under control of the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital may be carried on by that officer and the actual cost of such work reimbursed from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That such portion of this appropriation as the commissioners may deem necessary may be transferred to the Public Health Service of the Treasury Department for direct expenditure for the objects herein specified.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Collection and disposal of refuse," on page 31, line 15, to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$485,000," so as to read:

For dust prevention, sweeping, and cleaning streets, avenues, alleys, and suburban streets, under the immediate direction of the commissioners, and for cleaning snow and ice from streets, sidewalks, crosswalks, and gutters, in the discretion of the commissioners, including services and purchase and maintenance of equipment, rent of storage rooms; maintenance and repair of stables; hire and maintenance of horses; hire, purchase, maintenance, and repair of wagons, harness, and other equipment; main-

tenance and repair of non-passenger-carrying motor-propelled vehicles necessary in cleaning streets and purchase of motor-propelled street-cleaning equipment; and necessary incidental expenses, \$485,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 22, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$840,000" and insert "\$1,025,000," so as to read:

To enable the commissioners to carry out the provisions of existing law governing the collection and disposal of garbage, dead animals, night soil, and miscellaneous refuse and ashes in the District of Columbia, including inspection; fencing of public and private property designated by the commissioners as public dumps; and incidental expenses, \$1,025,000, including not to exceed \$14,000 for repair and improvement of the garbage-reduction plant.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 7, to strike out:

No part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be available for the operation of high-temperature incinerators for the disposal of combustible refuse.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public playgrounds," on page 32, line 12, after the word "services," to strike out "\$106,930" and insert "\$109,630," so as to read:

For personal services, \$109,630.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 21, after the word "truck," to strike out "\$33,330" and insert "\$38,950, of which \$5,000 shall be available for putting the Northeast Playground in condition for play purposes," so as to read:

For general maintenance, repairs and improvements, equipment, supplies, incidental and contingent expenses of playgrounds, including labor and maintenance of one motor truck, \$38,950, of which \$5,000 shall be available for putting the Northeast Playground in condition for play purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 5, after the word "term," to strike out "\$27,209" and insert "\$28,980," so as to read:

For the maintenance and contingent expenses of keeping open during the summer months the public-school playgrounds, under the direction and supervision of the commissioners; for special and temporary services, directors, assistants, and janitor service during the summer vacation, and, in the larger yards, daily after school hours during the school term, \$28,980.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 7, after the word "pools," to strike out "\$2,680" and insert "\$2,760," so as to read:

For supplies, repairs, maintenance, and necessary expenses of operating three swimming pools, \$2,760.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 9, after the word "maintenance," to strike out "\$3,250" and insert "\$4,000"; and in line 11, after the word "grounds," to strike out "\$1,150; in all, \$5,000" and insert "\$1,400; in all, \$6,000," so as to read:

Bathing pools: For superintendence, \$600; for temporary services, supplies, and maintenance, \$4,000; for repairs to buildings, pools, and upkeep of grounds, \$1,400; in all, \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Electrical department," on page 33, line 18, to increase the appropriation for personal services under the electrical department, from \$125,725 to \$128,520.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 2, after the word "items," to strike out "\$24,000" and insert "\$30,000," so as to read:

For general supplies, repairs, new batteries and battery supplies, telephone rental and purchase, telephone service charges, wire and cable for extension of telegraph and telephone service, repairs of lines and instruments, purchase of poles, tools, insulators, brackets, pins, hardware, cross arms, ice, record book, stationery,

livery, blacksmithing, extra labor, new boxes, maintenance of motor trucks and other necessary items, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 9, after the name "Metropolitan police department," to strike out "\$24,760" and insert "\$27,760," so as to read:

For placing wires of fire alarm, police patrol, and telephone services underground, extension and relocation of police-patrol and fire-alarm systems, purchase and installing additional lead-covered cables, labor, material, appurtenances, and other necessary equipment and expenses, including not to exceed \$4,100 for increased telephone facilities for the Metropolitan police department, \$27,760.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 1, after the word "controls," to strike out "\$962,000" and insert "\$862,000, together with \$25,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1933," so as to read:

Lighting: For purchase, installation, and maintenance of public lamps, lamp-posts, street designations, lanterns, and fixtures of all kinds on streets, avenues, roads, alleys, and public spaces, part cost of maintenance of airport and airway lights necessary for operation of the air mail, and for all necessary expenses in connection therewith, including rental of storerooms, extra labor, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor trucks, this sum to be expended in accordance with the provisions of sections 7 and 8 of the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1912 (36 Stat., pp. 1008-1011, sec. 7), and with the provisions of the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1913 (37 Stat., pp. 181-184, sec. 7), and other laws applicable thereto, and including not to exceed \$26,000 for operation and maintenance of electric traffic lights, signals, and controls, \$862,000, together with \$25,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1933:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the heading "Public schools," on page 35, line 22, after the word "superintendents," to strike out "\$606,027" and insert "\$609,600," so as to read:

For personal services of administrative and supervisory officers in accordance with the act fixing and regulating the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, approved June 4, 1924 (43 Stat. pp. 367-375), including salaries of presidents of teachers colleges in the salary schedule for first assistant superintendents, \$609,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 25, to include the appropriation for personal services of clerks and other employees of the public schools from \$150,425 to \$153,230.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 6, to strike out "\$36,033" and insert "\$38,600," so as to read:

For personal services in the department of school attendance and work permits in accordance with the act approved June 4, 1924 (43 Stat. pp. 367-375), the act approved February 5, 1925 (43 Stat. pp. 806-808), and the act approved May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. p. 998), \$38,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 36, line 10, after the word "class," to strike out "seven" and insert "eleven," so as to read:

For personal services of teachers and librarians in accordance with the act approved June 4, 1924 (43 Stat. pp. 367-375), including for teachers colleges assistant professors in salary class 11, and professors in salary class 12, \$5,996,414.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 20, to insert:

No part of any appropriation made in this act shall be paid to any person employed under or in connection with the public schools of the District of Columbia who shall solicit or receive, or permit to be solicited or received, on any public-school premises, any subscription or donation of money or other thing of value from any pupil enrolled in such public schools for presentation of testimonials to school officials or for any purpose except such as may be authorized by the Board of Education at a stated meeting upon the written recommendation of the superintendent of schools.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Care of buildings and grounds," on page 39, line 11, to strike out "\$825,035" and insert "\$829,600," so as to read:

For personal services, including care of smaller buildings and rented rooms at a rate not to exceed \$96 per annum for the care of each schoolroom, other than those occupied by atypical or ungraded classes, for which service an amount not to exceed \$120 per annum may be allowed, \$829,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 1, after the word "power," to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$245,000," so as to read:

For fuel, gas, and electric light and power, \$245,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Furniture," on page 40, line 7, after the name "Phelps Vocational School," to strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$45,000," and, in line 10, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$53,840" and insert "\$68,840," so as to read:

For completely furnishing and equipping buildings and additions to buildings, as follows: School in Foxhall Village, \$3,200; Logan School, \$6,000; Phelps Vocational School, \$45,000; Keene School, \$6,000; Bancroft School, \$5,600; Douglass-Simmons assembly-gymnasium and M Street Junior High School gymnasium, \$3,040; in all, \$68,840, to be immediately available and to continue available until June 30, 1935.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 8, to insert:

For the purchase of books and equipment for the teachers colleges, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 2, to strike out—

No part of the appropriations herein made for the public schools of the District of Columbia shall be used for the free instruction of pupils who dwell outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to pupils who are enrolled in the schools of the District of Columbia on the date of the approval of this act.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

The children of officers and men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and children of other employees of the United States stationed outside the District of Columbia shall be admitted to the public schools without payment of tuition.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 3, after the word "trucks," to strike out "\$330,000" and insert "\$380,000," so as to read:

For repairs and improvements to school buildings, repairing and renewing heating, plumbing, and ventilating apparatus, installation and repair of electric equipment, and installation of sanitary drinking fountains, and maintenance of motor trucks, \$380,000, of which amount \$100,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Buildings and grounds," on page 43, line 25, to strike out "\$85,000" and insert "\$105,000," so as to read:

For the erection of an 8-room building on a site already appropriated for in the vicinity of the Logan School, \$105,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 3, to strike out "\$140,000" and insert "\$166,000," so as to read:

For the construction of an addition to the Deal Junior High School, including 10 classrooms and 1 gymnasium, \$166,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this item and the items following for the construction of an addition to the Browne Junior High School and for beginning the construction of a senior high school, increasing the appropriation from \$433,000 to \$500,000, raised the limit from \$1,000,000 to \$1,200,000. It seems to me that with the reduction in wages, the reduction in prices of building materials and various commodities entering into the construction of schools, there is no necessity for increasing the limit from \$100,000 to \$300,000 and no reason for increasing the other costs in the items just referred to.

I shall be glad to hear from the Senator from Connecticut with respect to the matter.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the testimony before the committee which led us to restore the Budget figures was that, while it is true that costs have come down, the Budget estimate is very much less than it would have been for building the same class of schools two or three years ago. The Budget has taken full consideration of the very much lowered cost of building materials. The House arbitrarily cut down still further the item, and we were informed that the schools could not be built properly at the lower figure.

With regard to the item beginning in line 7, on page 44, for a senior high school in the Reno section, which is to be called the Woodrow Wilson High School, on the floor of the House the Budget estimate of \$500,000 was cut to \$433,000. The testimony before the committee was that this reduction would result in one month's delay in the opening of the school. It is expected that this school building will be completed and ready for occupancy one year from the coming fall, but if the appropriation shall be left at the figure provided by the House it will be impossible to get this school open in time for the beginning of the fall term.

With regard to the amount within which the building must be constructed, the Budget estimated the figure at \$1,300,000 because that was about the figure within the limits of which the last senior high-school building was constructed. That building was constructed for very much less than the original estimate on account of the lower cost of building material; and undoubtedly, as the construction of the new senior high school proceeds, if costs continue to decrease, in next year's appropriation bill it will not be necessary to appropriate the entire balance, but a smaller sum.

It was pointed out to the committee, however, by the architect and by the engineer-commissioner that if the cost were limited to \$1,000,000 it would be necessary to make this school very much less attractive and effective than it ought to be, considering its importance and its position on one of the great parkways and one of the most conspicuous sites in the city. We were shown some drawings, and I can assure the Senator that there is nothing extravagant about the school. It will be built wisely at the lowest possible figure. I think the Senator will find, on investigation, that the probabilities are that it will not cost \$1,300,000, but that is the best figure at which we could arrive, considering the cost of the last senior high school.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if there is any one thing in connection with which I am willing to be extravagant it is in the construction of schoolhouses. I take a great interest in the school system here, and have been very anxious to see proper buildings constructed. However, it has seemed to me, as I have visited some of them, that the architectural features have not always been such as to excite admiration, and I have felt that the cost of the ground upon which some of the buildings have been erected has been entirely too great and that some of the construction contracts have been too high.

Of course I can not criticize these items because I have not had the advantage of the testimony which has been adduced before the various committees, but it has seemed to me, in this particular period, with lower costs, that these prices were a little high.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 44, line 6, after the word "gymnasium," to strike out "\$140,000" and insert "\$166,000," so as to read:

For the construction of an addition to the Browne Junior High School, including 10 classrooms and 1 gymnasium, \$166,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 9, after the words "in the Reno section," to strike out "\$433,000" and

insert "\$500,000," and in line 11, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,300,000," so as to read:

For beginning the construction of a senior high-school building at Forty-first and Chesapeake Streets NW., in the Reno section, \$500,000, and the commissioners are authorized to enter into contract or contracts for such building, at a cost not to exceed \$1,300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 12, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$798,000" and insert "\$937,000," so as to read:

In all, \$937,000, to be immediately available and to be disbursed and accounted for as "Buildings and grounds, public schools," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund and remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 3, to insert:

For the purchase of school building and playground sites, as follows:

For the purchase of additional land at the Phelps Vocational School for elementary-school purposes, \$67,000.

For the purchase of additional land at the Syphax School, \$25,000; in all, \$92,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for salaries of the Metropolitan police, on page 46, line 12, to increase the appropriation for personal services from \$115,450 to \$117,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 14, to increase the appropriation for fuel for the Metropolitan police from \$7,000 to \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 12, after the words "harbor patrol," to strike out "\$79,210" and insert "\$84,000," so as to read:

For miscellaneous and contingent expenses, including rewards for fugitives, purchase of gas equipment and firearms, maintenance of card system, stationery, city directories, books of reference, periodicals, newspapers, telegraphing, telephoning, photographs, rental and maintenance of teletype system and labor-saving devices, telephone service charges, purchase, maintenance, and servicing of radiobroadcasting systems, including \$11,000 for use only in purchasing, maintaining, and servicing additional radio receiving sets for automobiles and the purchase and installation of radio input system in the several precinct stations, bureaus, and offices, purchase of equipment, gas, ice, washing, meals for prisoners, medals of award, not to exceed \$300 for car tickets, furniture and repair thereto, beds and bed clothing, insignia of office, police equipments and repairs to same, and mounted equipment, flags and halyards, storage of stolen or abandoned property, and traveling and other expenses incurred in prevention and detection of crime and other necessary expenses, including expenses of harbor patrol, \$84,000, of which amount not exceeding \$2,000 may be expended by the major and superintendent of police for prevention and detection of crime, under his certificate, approved by the commissioners, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 1, after the word "condemned," to strike out "\$72,200" and insert "\$75,000," and in line 3, after the word "wagons," to insert "and not to exceed \$2,800 for two police cruisers," so as to read:

For purchase, exchange, and maintenance of passenger-carrying and other motor vehicles and the replacement of those worn out in the service and condemned, \$75,000, including not to exceed \$2,000 for two patrol wagons and not to exceed \$2,800 for two police cruisers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, at the end of line 9, to strike out "\$45,000" and insert "\$54,000," so as to read:

Uniforms: For furnishing uniforms and other official equipment prescribed by department regulations as necessary and requisite in the performance of duty to officers and members of the Metropolitan police, including cleaning, alteration, and repair of articles transferred from one individual to another, \$54,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fire department, miscellaneous," on page 49, at the end of line 19, to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$26,000," so as to read:

Uniforms: For furnishing uniforms and other official equipment prescribed by department regulations as necessary and requisite in the performance of duty to officers and members of the fire department, including cleaning, alteration, and repair of articles transferred from one individual to another, \$26,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 1, after the word "tools," to strike out "\$42,740" and insert "\$45,740," so as to read:

For repairs to apparatus, motor vehicles, and other motor-driven apparatus, fire boat and for new apparatus, new motor vehicles, new appliances, employment of mechanics, helpers, and laborers in the fire department repair shop, and for the purchase of necessary supplies, materials, equipment, and tools, \$45,740: *Provided*, That the commissioners are authorized, in their discretion, to build or construct, in whole or in part, fire-fighting apparatus in the fire-department repair shop.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 19, to increase the appropriation for fuel for the fire department from \$20,000 to \$23,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 23, to increase the appropriation for contingent expenses, etc., for the fire department from \$20,000 to \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Health department," on page 52, line 9, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$32,820" and insert "\$34,820," so as to read:

For the maintenance of a dispensary or dispensaries for the treatment of indigent persons suffering from tuberculosis and of indigent persons suffering from venereal diseases, including payment for personal services, rent, supplies, and contingent expenses, \$34,820.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 25, after the word "milk," to strike out "\$6,600" and insert "\$8,000," so as to read:

For contingent expenses incident to the enforcement of an act relating to the adulteration of foods and drugs in the District of Columbia, approved February 17, 1898 (30 Stat. 246-248), an act to prevent the adulteration of candy in the District of Columbia, approved May 5, 1898 (30 Stat. 398), an act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes, approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 768-772), and an act to regulate, within the District of Columbia, the sale of milk, cream, and ice cream, and for other purposes, approved February 27, 1925 (43 Stat. 1004-1008), including traveling and other necessary expenses of dairy-farm inspectors; and including not to exceed \$100 for special services in detecting adulteration of drugs and foods, including candy and milk, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 3, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$312" and insert "\$480," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That inspectors of dairy farms may receive an allowance for furnishing privately owned motor vehicles in the performance of official duties at the rate of not to exceed \$480 per annum for each inspector.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 13, after the word "supplies," to strike out "\$45,000" and insert "\$48,330," so as to read:

Child welfare and hygiene: For maintaining a child-hygiene service, including the establishment and maintenance of child-welfare stations for the clinical examinations, advice, care, and maintenance of children under 6 years of age, payment for personal services, rent, fuel, periodicals, and payment for personal services, rent, fuel, periodicals, and supplies, \$48,330.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Courts and prisons," on page 57, line 8, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "3" and insert "7," and in line 9, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "23" and insert "19," so as to read:

For not exceeding 7 criers, not exceeding 19 deputy marshals who act as bailiffs, clerks of jury commissioners, and per diems of jury commissioners, and for expenses of meals and lodging for jurors in United States cases, and of bailiffs in attendance upon

same when ordered by the court, \$46,740: *Provided*, That the compensation of each jury commissioner for the fiscal year 1934 shall not exceed \$250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public welfare—Division of Child Welfare," on page 60, line 8, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$4,000," so as to read:

Administration: For administrative expenses, including placing and visiting children, city directory, purchase of books of reference and periodicals not exceeding \$50, and all office and sundry expenses, \$4,000; and no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used for the purpose of visiting any ward of the Board of Public Welfare placed outside the District of Columbia and the States of Virginia and Maryland; and a ward placed outside said District and States of Virginia and Maryland shall be visited not less than once a year by a voluntary agent or correspondent of said board, and that said board shall have power, upon proper showing, in its discretion, to discharge from guardianship any child committed to its care.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General administration, workhouse and reformatory, District of Columbia," on page 62, line 21, after the word "services," to strike out "\$290,540" and insert "\$326,090," so as to read:

For personal services, \$326,090.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 5, after the word "items," to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$340,000," so as to read:

For maintenance, care, and support of inmates, rewards for fugitives, discharge gratuities provided by law, medical supplies, newspapers, books, books of reference, and periodicals, farm implements, tools, equipment, transportation expenses, purchase and maintenance of livestock and horses, purchase, exchange, maintenance, operation, and repair of non-passenger-carrying vehicles and motor bus; fuel for heating, lighting, and power, and all other necessary items, \$340,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, at the beginning of line 8, after the word "necessary," to strike out "utilities" and insert "utilities, and," and in line 9, after the figures "\$46,000," to insert a comma and "together with a further sum of not exceeding \$54,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for maintenance, care, and support of inmates, and so forth, workhouse and reformatory, District of Columbia, contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1932," so as to read:

For continuing construction of permanent buildings, including sewers, water mains, roads, and other necessary utilities, and for equipment for new buildings, \$46,000, together with a further sum of not exceeding \$54,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for maintenance, care, and support of inmates, and so forth, workhouse and reformatory, District of Columbia, contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1932.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 18, after the word "enterprises," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$28,000," so as to read:

For repairs to buildings and grounds, and maintenance of utilities, marine and railroad transportation facilities, and mechanical equipment not used in industrial enterprises, \$28,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Tuberculosis Hospital," on page 65, line 15, to increase the appropriation for personal services in the tuberculosis hospital from \$80,200 to \$81,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 22, after the word "items," to strike out "\$49,000" and insert "\$61,000," so as to read:

For provisions, fuel, forage, harness, and vehicles, and repairs to same, gas, ice, shoes, clothing, dry goods, tailoring, drugs and medical supplies, furniture and bedding, kitchen utensils, medical books, books of reference, and periodicals not to exceed \$200, temporary services not to exceed \$1,000, maintenance of motor truck, and other necessary items, \$61,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 24, after the word "sidewalks," to strike out "\$4,000" and insert "\$4,750," so as to read:

For repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, including roads and sidewalks, \$4,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Children's Tuberculosis Sanatorium," on page 66, line 5, to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$35,000," so as to read:

For personal services, maintenance, and other necessary expenses, including maintenance of motor vehicles and the purchase and maintenance of horses and wagons, \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 7, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$1,950" and insert "\$3,000," and at the end of line 9, to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$60,000," so as to read:

For completely furnishing and equipping the Children's Tuberculosis Sanatorium, including not to exceed \$3,000 for the purchase of one nonpassenger and two passenger-carrying motor vehicles (including one bus), \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Gallinger Municipal Hospital," on page 66, line 13, after the word "labor," to strike out "\$323,816" and insert "\$329,830," so as to read:

Salaries: For personal services, including not to exceed \$2,000 for temporary labor, \$329,830.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 24, after the word "vehicles," to insert "for purchase, not exceeding \$3,500, and maintenance of one motor ambulance," and on page 67, line 2, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$190,909" and insert "\$210,000," so as to read:

For maintenance of the hospital; for maintenance of the quarantine station, smallpox hospital, and public crematorium, including expenses incident to furnishing proper containers for the reception, burial, and identification of the ashes of all human bodies of indigent persons that are cremated at the public crematorium and remain unclaimed after 12 months from the date of such cremation; for maintenance and purchase of horses and horse-drawn vehicles; for medical books, books of reference and periodicals, not to exceed \$500; for maintenance of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles; for purchase, not exceeding \$3,500, and maintenance of one motor ambulance; and for all other necessary expenses, \$210,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 4, after the word "grounds," to strike out "\$9,300" and insert "\$9,500," so as to read:

For repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, \$9,500, including not to exceed \$3,500 for the rearrangement of the electric service and wiring at the Gallinger Municipal Hospital and the jail for master metering, for the erection of a structure to house metering and switching equipment, and for the purchase of electric meters.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, after line 8, to insert:

For completing construction at Gallinger Municipal Hospital of an additional ward building for contagious diseases, \$290,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "District Training School," on page 67, line 18, after the word "labor," to strike out "\$82,030" and insert "\$85,110," so as to read:

For personal services, including not to exceed \$1,000 for temporary labor, \$85,110.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, at the end of line 22, to strike out "\$80,000" and insert "\$90,000," so as to read:

For maintenance and other necessary expenses, including the maintenance of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles, the purchase and maintenance of horses and wagons, farm machinery and implements, \$90,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 24, to strike out "\$8,750" and insert "\$9,750," so as to read:

For repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, \$9,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 68, to insert:

For purchase and exchange of one 2-ton motor truck, \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Industrial Home School for Colored Children," on page 68, line 4, after the word "services," to strike out "\$34,280" and insert "\$35,490," and in line 5, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$34,780" and insert "\$35,990," so as to read:

Salaries: For personal services, \$35,490; temporary labor, \$500; in all, \$35,990.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 10, after the word "materials," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$31,500," so as to read:

For maintenance, including purchase and maintenance of farm implements, horses, wagons, and harness, and maintenance of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles, and not to exceed \$1,250 for manual-training equipment and materials, \$31,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 12, to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$2,660," so as to read:

For repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, \$2,660.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Industrial Home School," on page 68, line 22, after the word "vehicle," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$23,000," so as to read:

For maintenance, including care of horses, purchase and care of wagon and harness, maintenance of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicle, \$23,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Home for Aged and Infirm," on page 69, line 8, after the word "vehicles," to strike out "\$60,000" and insert "\$70,000," so as to read:

For provisions, fuel, forage, harness, and vehicles and repairs to same, ice, shoes, clothing, dry goods, tailoring, drugs and medical supplies, furniture and bedding, kitchen utensils, and other necessary items, and maintenance of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles, \$70,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Emergency relief," on page 69, after line 21, to strike out—

To enable the Board of Public Welfare to provide for the relief of all needy persons not otherwise provided for by appropriations herein made to such board, \$625,000, payable wholly from the revenues of the District of Columbia.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

For the purpose of affording relief to residents of the District of Columbia who are unemployed or otherwise in distress because of the existing emergency, to be expended by the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia by loan, employment, and/or direct relief, in the discretion of the Board of Commissioners and under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the board and without regard to the provisions of any other law, payable from the revenues of the District of Columbia, \$625,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed 8 per cent of such amount shall be available for administrative expenses, including necessary personal services.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Militia," on page 74, line 18, after the word "services," to strike out "\$17,417" and insert "\$24,750"; in line 19, after the word "labor," to strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$6,650; pay of troops other than Government employees, \$10,000"; and on page 75, line 20, after the word "service," to strike out "\$8,400; in all, \$31,817" and insert "\$13,000; in all, \$54,400," so as to make the paragraph read:

For personal services, \$24,750; temporary labor, \$6,650; pay of troops other than Government employees, \$10,000; for expenses of camps, including hire of horses for officers required to be mounted, and for the payment of commutation of subsistence for enlisted men who may be detailed to guard or move the United States property at home stations on days immediately preceding and immediately following the annual encampments; damages to pri-

vate property incident to encampment; reimbursement to the United States for loss of property for which the District of Columbia may be held responsible; cleaning and repairing uniforms, arms, and equipment; instruction, purchase, and maintenance of athletic, gymnastic, and recreational equipment at armory or field encampments, not to exceed \$500; practice marches, drills, and parades; rent of armories, drill halls, and storehouses; fuel, light, heat, care, and repair of armories, offices, and storehouses; machinery and dock, including dredging alongside of dock; construction of buildings for storage and other purposes at target range; telephone service; printing, stationery, and postage; horses and mules for mounted organizations; maintenance and operation of passenger and non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles; street-car fares (not to exceed \$200) necessarily used in the transaction of official business; not exceeding \$400 for traveling expenses, including attendance at meetings or conventions of associations pertaining to the National Guard; and for general incidental expenses of the service, \$13,000; in all, \$54,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public buildings and public parks, general expenses, public parks," on page 77, line 3, after the word "exceed," to strike out "two" and insert "four," and in line 6, after the words "and so forth," to strike out "\$406,820" and insert "\$481,820," so as to read:

General expenses: For general expenses in connection with the maintenance, care, improvement, furnishing of heat, light, and power of public parks, grounds, fountains, and reservations, propagating gardens and greenhouses under the jurisdiction of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, including \$5,000 for the maintenance of the tourists' camp on its present site in East Potomac Park, and including personal services of seasonal or intermittent employees at per diem rates of pay approved by the director, not exceeding current rates of pay for similar employment in the District of Columbia; the hire of draft animals with or without drivers at local rates approved by the director; the purchase and maintenance of draft animals, harness, and wagons; contingent expenses; city directories; communication service; car fare; traveling expenses, professional, scientific, technical, and law books; periodicals and reference books; blank books and forms; photographs; dictionaries and maps; leather and rubber articles for the protection of employees and property; the maintenance, repair, exchange, and operation of not to exceed four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and all necessary bicycles, motor cycles, and self-propelled machinery; the purchase, maintenance, and repair of equipment and fixtures, etc., \$481,820.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 7, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$35,000"; in line 11, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$75,000"; and in line 13, after the word "sections," to strike out "C and D" and insert "C, D, and G," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That not exceeding \$35,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended for placing and maintaining portions of the parks in condition for outdoor sports and for expenses incident to the conducting of band concerts in the parks; not exceeding \$75,000 for the improvement and maintenance as recreation parks of Sections C, D, and G, Anacostia Park; not exceeding \$30,000 for the improvement of the Rock Creek and Potomac connecting parkway; and not exceeding \$10,000 for the erection of minor auxiliary structures.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital Park and Planning Commission," on page 78, after line 2, to strike out:

For reimbursement to the United States in compliance with section 4 of the act approved May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), as amended, \$1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 18, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$36,800," so as to read:

For each and every purpose, except the acquisition of land, requisite for and incident to the work of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as authorized by the act entitled "An act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital," approved June 6, 1924 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 71), as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, not to exceed \$1,500 for printing and binding, not to exceed \$500 for traveling expenses and car fare of employees of the commission, and not to exceed \$300 for professional, scientific, technical, and reference books, and periodicals, \$36,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Zoological Park," on page 79, line 13, after the word "periodicals," to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$210,200," so as to read:

For roads, walks, bridges, water supply, sewerage, and drainage; grading, planting, and otherwise improving the grounds, erecting and repairing buildings and inclosures; care, subsistence, purchase, and transportation of animals; necessary employees; traveling and incidental expenses not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed \$2,000 for travel and field expenses in the United States and foreign countries for the procurement of live specimens and for the care, subsistence, and transportation of specimens obtained in the course of such travel; maintenance and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle required for official purposes; for the purchase, issue, operation, maintenance, repair, and exchange of bicycles and non-passenger-carrying motor vehicles, revolvers and ammunition; not exceeding \$2,500 for purchasing and supplying uniforms to park police, keepers, and assistant keepers; not exceeding \$100 for the purchase of necessary books and periodicals, \$210,200, no part of which sum shall be available for architect's fees or compensation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, after line 14, to insert:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution are hereby directed to cause a study to be made as to the desirability of charging fees for admission to the National Zoological Park and to report thereon to Congress at the opening of the next regular session.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Water service: Washington Aqueduct," on page 80, line 15, after the word "therewith," to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$443,000," so as to read:

For operation, including salaries of all necessary employees, maintenance and repair of Washington Aqueducts and their accessories, including Dalecarlia, Georgetown, McMillan Park, first and second High Service Reservoirs, Washington Aqueduct tunnel, the filtration plants, the pumping plants, and the plant for the preliminary treatment of the water supply, ordinary repairs, grading, opening ditches, and other maintenance of Conduit Road, purchase, installation, and maintenance of water meters on Federal services, purchase, care, repair, and operation of vehicles, including the purchase and exchange of one passenger-carrying motor vehicle at a cost not to exceed \$650; purchase and repair of rubber boots and protective apparel, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, \$443,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 5, after the word "exceed" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "\$1,600" and insert "\$2,000"; in line 6, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$3,000"; and in line 13, after the word "maintenance," to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$323,160," so as to read:

For maintenance of the water department distribution system, including pumping stations and machinery, water mains, valves, fire and public hydrants, and all buildings and accessories, and motor trucks, and the replacement by purchase and/or exchange of the following motor-propelled vehicles: Three 750-pound trucks, not to exceed \$550 each; one 1½-ton truck, not to exceed \$700; one 3-ton truck, not to exceed \$2,000; and one 5-ton truck, not to exceed \$3,000; purchase of fuel, oils, waste, and other materials, and the employment of all labor necessary for the proper execution of this work; and for contingent expenses, including books, blanks, stationery, printing and binding not to exceed \$2,000, postage, purchase of technical reference books and periodicals, not to exceed \$275, and other necessary items, \$7,500; in all for maintenance \$323,160, of which not exceeding \$30,000 shall be available for continuing a survey of water waste in the distribution system, including personal services, and not exceeding \$5,000 shall be available for operation of pumps at Bryant Street pumping station upon interruption of service from Dalecarlia pumping station.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 21, after the word "system," to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$240,000," so as to read:

For extension of the water department distribution system, laying of such service mains as may be necessary under the assessment system, \$240,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 2, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$110,000" and insert "\$124,540," so as to read:

For installing and repairing water meters on services to private residences and business places as may not be required to install meters under existing regulations, as may be directed by the commissioners; said meters at all times to remain the property of the District of Columbia, \$124,540.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 4, after the word "hydrants," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$21,100," so as to read:

For installing fire and public hydrants, \$21,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, after line 12, to strike out:

Sec. 6. No part of the appropriations contained in this act shall be used to pay any increase in the salary of any officer or employee of the District of Columbia by reason of the reallocation of the position of such officer or employee to a higher grade since June 30, 1932, by the Personnel Classification Board or the Civil Service Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, by direction of the committee, I am authorized to offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It proposes to incorporate in the bill language which has been in the bill in preceding years, and the committee saw no reason why it should not be in the bill this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 10, after the word "Columbia," it is proposed to insert the following:

And the tax rate in effect in the fiscal year 1933 on real estate and tangible personal property subject to taxation in the District of Columbia shall not be decreased for the fiscal year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I inquire the reason for that amendment, in view of the change in the valuation of property and the rather unprecedented financial situation in the District of Columbia. It may be wise, but I can conceive of contingencies that might necessitate some rearrangement of the fiscal system and a refinancing.

Mr. BINGHAM. It has been the practice, Mr. President, for the past few years, particularly since the adoption of the lump-sum contribution, to take away from the commissioners the option of lowering the District taxes. The committee felt, in view of the fact that the Government made a contribution to the District, and the District asked for certain expenditures sometimes larger than we thought necessary, that they should come out of District taxes, and that the people of the District should not come back on us to lower their taxes and take advantage of the situation to have the Government make a larger contribution. Why the House left out the provision this year, I do not know. It was believed wise to put it back. In the opinion of the committee, the way to reduce taxes in the District is to make the assessment come a little nearer the value of the property rather than to reduce the tax rate.

Mr. KING. I shall not object, but I want to say very frankly that, so far as I am concerned, I would be willing to give greater powers to the commissioners to deal with the matters within the District, and thus relieve Congress of many of the questions and problems that are now presented to it for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. I offer another amendment and ask that it may be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "\$51,250" and insert "\$59,250," and on the same page, line 15, to strike out "\$50,500" and insert "\$58,500."

Mr. KING. Is there any reason for that amendment?

Mr. BINGHAM. We took this item, which is for the District Employment Service, out of the independent offices appropriation bill, with the idea that it should be put in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have another amendment, which is a mere correction of language in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, after line 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

For grading, including construction of necessary culverts and retaining walls, the following.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. I offer another amendment by direction of the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether the amendments which he is tendering now have been agreed to by the committee?

Mr. BINGHAM. They have been agreed to by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 44, after line 11, it is proposed to insert:

For completing the erection of a junior high-school building on a site already purchased for that purpose at Nineteenth Street and Minnesota Avenue SE., in Anacostia, \$175,000.

Not to exceed \$45,000 of the unexpended balance of the reappropriation for rehabilitation of the Wilson Teachers College, contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act, fiscal year 1933, is hereby made immediately available and shall continue available until June 30, 1934, for the improvement of the central heating plant for the M Street Junior High and Douglass-Simmons Schools.

Mr. BINGHAM. This amendment is designed to permit the completion of a building already under way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. I offer another amendment by direction of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 63, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

To provide a working capital fund for such industrial enterprises as may be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, \$46,000: *Provided*, That the various departments and institutions of the District of Columbia and the Federal Government may purchase, at fair market prices, as determined by the commissioners, such surplus products and services as meet their requirements; receipts from the sale of products and services shall be deposited to the credit of said working capital fund, and said fund, including all receipts credited thereto, shall be used as a revolving fund for the fiscal year 1934 for the purchase and repair of machinery, tools, and equipment, purchase of raw materials and manufacturing supplies, purchase, maintenance, and operation of non-passenger-carrying vehicles, purchase and maintenance of horses, and purchase of fuel for manufacturing purposes; for freight, personal services, and all other necessary expenses; and for the payment to inmates or their dependents of such pecuniary earnings as the commissioners may deem proper.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator for an explanation of that amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, this item has been in the bill for several years. The Senator will realize that at Lorton, where the District reformatory is located, and at Occoquan, where the other institution called the workhouse is located, it is necessary to give the prisoners something to do. They may make bricks; they make automobile tags, and so forth. Under the existing law the products of the workhouse and the reformatory may be sold in the open market to anyone, but this limits the sale to the Federal Government and its institutions and the institutions of the District of Columbia. It also provides \$46,000 for a revolving fund to be used for the purchase of materials, and so

forth, in these institutions. It has been customary to put the item in the bill, and the commissioners felt very strongly about the necessity for it.

Mr. KING. I do not disagree; but I was wondering whether it was the purpose to increase the activities of the institutions referred to.

Mr. BINGHAM. No; not at all, Mr. President. As a matter of fact, this provision limits the sale to public institutions of the Government and the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may correct all totals in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Connecticut where is the provision which reinstates the old meter system for taxicabs in Washington?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, there is no provision that reinstates the old meter system which used to enable a taxicab to charge something like 80 cents for a trip from the railroad station or the Capitol to the Mayflower Hotel. The meter system suggested by the committee would limit the rate to 25 cents for the first 2 miles or a fraction thereof and 10 cents a mile thereafter.

Mr. BLACK. May I ask the Senator on what page that amendment is found?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is found on page 7, lines 11 and 12.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, have we voted on that amendment?

Mr. BINGHAM. That amendment was adopted when we reached page 7.

Mr. BLACK. I desire to move to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I offered no objection to the Senator's request for reconsideration.

Mr. BLACK. I understood that.

Mr. President, I am not sufficiently familiar with the facts to go into any extended argument on this amendment; but I do know that I have ridden in a number of taxicabs, and I have yet to find the first taxicab driver who is independent of the larger taxicab union who has not expressed himself to me as being opposed to being forced to raise the rates above the 20 cents which they now charge. At this time, when the banks are declaring moratoriums all over the United States, when people are harder pressed than they ever have been in the history of this country, I do not see why we should by legislation attempt to force a higher taxicab in the city of Washington.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, is this the provision in the bill which undertakes to put meters upon taxicabs?

Mr. BLACK. It is. It undertakes to reinstate the meters.

Mr. BORAH. I agree with the Senator. I suppose I have canvassed a hundred taxicab drivers, and I have yet to find the first one who is in favor of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Let me ask whether this is not a change of the law.

Mr. BLACK. It states:

No part of the appropriations contained in this act shall be used—

It is an express statement of law in an appropriation bill. It seems to me that probably it is subject to a point of order, but I am not raising that point.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the language to which the Senator refers was put in by the House:

No part of the appropriations contained in this act shall be used for or in connection with the preparation, issuance, publication, or enforcement of any regulation or order of the Public Utilities Commission requiring the installation of meters in taxicabs—

Obviously that is new legislation, but the House put it in. What the Senate did was to add to that an amending clause so that the Public Utilities Commission could not require the installation of meters—

if the initial rate exceeds 25 cents for the first 2 miles, or portion thereof, and 10 cents a mile thereafter.

That is the language.

Mr. BORAH. That is general legislation.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is an amendment to the legislation put in the bill by the House.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; but it is clearly legislation.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is a limitation, Mr. President.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; but it seems to me general legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say that there are hundreds of perfectly splendid young men—I know some of them who are college men—who find that the only way they can make a living is to run these independent taxicabs. This is an effort to squeeze out everybody except the large concerns which are vitally interested in it for themselves, of course.

Mr. BORAH. Of course it is.

Mr. McKELLAR. But I do not think we ought to agree to the amendment, and I hope it will not be agreed to.

I want to add this, if I may make a parliamentary inquiry: Is this provision subject to a point of order? If it is, I am going to make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is an amendment to the House provision, and the House provision makes this language in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope it will be voted down, then. I am sorry it is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. At the committee hearing the names of more than 400 taxicab drivers were presented, asking that meters go on. To-day I have ridden in three taxicabs, and I asked the driver of each one of them, and each one of them said that he prefers the meters.

The trouble with the situation in Washington is that there is a taxicab company here which rents the taxicabs to its men for \$4 a day. There is no financial responsibility. There are more accidents in Washington than in any other city in the United States in proportion to its size; and there is no protection whatever to the public against these taxicab drivers as the matter now stands.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it is all right to require liability insurance, and I should be perfectly willing to support a proposal which would put into effect an insurance requirement; but this is a case where there may be 400 in favor of it but there are 400 who are opposed to it, and the 400 who are opposed to it are the independent young fellows who are seeking under the most adverse circumstances to make a living by running independent taxicabs. As one of them said to me the other day, "When that goes into effect, I go out of business." It is the protection of the young fellows who are trying to make a living in that way that I think we ought to take into consideration.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. I want to say to the Senator from Idaho that those independents, the young men to whom the Senator refers, will be forced as a result of this legislation to buy meters, and they have not the money with which to buy them. The object is to drive them out of business.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. BYRNES. Just at this time we are being furnished splendid taxicab service, at lower rates than in any other city in the country. The object of this amendment is to increase taxi fares at a time when people have less money to pay for taxi fares than ever before.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BORAH. I supposed I had the floor, but I have not.

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator from Idaho. I am perfectly willing to yield the floor. I wanted the matter to be discussed.

Mr. BORAH. I do not desire to take the floor away from the Senator.

Mr. BLACK. I am perfectly willing to give the Senator the floor.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, just to reply?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KEAN. Forty-five dollars is the price of a meter, and they can pay it in monthly installments.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and the young fellow is already trying to pay for his taxicab in monthly installments, and if the Senator would listen to the stories of some of them who are undertaking to do that he would not want to add \$45 to what they now have to pay.

Here is a young man who is paying his way through school through the effort of running a taxicab. It is proposed to add \$45 a year to his expenses; and for whose benefit is the \$45? It is for the benefit of the combination, not the independent young fellow.

Mr. KEAN. It is for the benefit of the public. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. So far as these young men go, I want to say that most of them that I have talked to have been in favor of a taximeter, and a lot of the people who ride in the cabs are in favor of a taximeter, because at the present time if you get in a cab at the Union Station they will say, "We are now on a zone system," and you soon get to the limits of the zone, and the Mayflower Hotel is four zones away, and they charge you 80 cents. We have had that kind of testimony.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know where that kind of testimony came from, and I do not know who is responsible for it; but I know that for 20 cents these young men haul you anywhere within the District, and you feel as though you were taking money out of their pockets when you pay them.

Mr. KEAN. I agree to that.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if this matter is going on to-night, I am going to call for a quorum. I insist that the facts shall be presented.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I called attention to this matter, and asked for the reconsideration, in order that we might vote to strike out the amendment. I believe the Senate will vote to strike it out. I believe it is wholly unjustified. I have been told by the boys who drive these taxicabs that there are very few companies that sell meters, and that it is a meter company that in the main has sought to bring about the reinstatement of meters.

Mr. BORAH. The Pittsburgh company that makes these meters is very much interested in the matter, I presume.

Mr. BLACK. I do not say that with any degree of criticism for the Senators who favor this amendment. I am simply stating the idea that the boys have who drive these taxicabs; I do know, however, whoever is for it or whoever is against it, that this would increase the present taxicab rates in Washington. I do know that the people are not able to stand increases at this time. If there should be any change, they should be decreased. I know also, from the boys I have talked to, that the independent drivers, those who are making their living out of using and driving one car, have expressed their vigorous opposition to this proposal to reinstate meters.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator is not in favor of reducing the compensation of the employees of the Departments and

at the same time increasing the cost of their transportation, is he?

Mr. BLACK. Why, of course it is not fair. We have had a movement here to decrease the wages of Government employees, and they have been decreased; and now here comes a proposition to raise the price of their taxicab fares.

I ride in taxicabs. Nobody can make me believe that 25 cents is cheaper than 20 cents. I ride in a taxicab to the zone in which I live, out several miles, and it costs 40 cents. I rode the same distance with the old meter system—they claim now that this is not like the old meter system—and it cost me \$2.05. This may not be intended to reinstate the old meter system, but it will eventually lead to that very thing, and it will eventually lead to the big taxicab companies's raising the price when they have squeezed out the little taxicab drivers.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, under the meter system, when you step in the taxicab how much does the meter show? About 25 cents, does it not?

Mr. BLACK. You start off at 25 cents. Before you go a foot you start off with 25 cents.

I do not know about the 400 signatures referred to by the Senator from New Jersey. They may have had 400 signatures signed to something; but if you will go out here now and get a taxicab and ride down the street with some boy who owns his car, you will find that he is not favorable to being coerced into a system which will place him at the mercy of the larger taxicab companies; but, even if he were, we are not justified in raising taxicab rates now.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I have taken pains to inquire from the drivers of the different taxicabs in which I have ridden—I use them every day—and I have not yet found one who was not protesting against the reinstatement of the meter system.

Mr. KEAN. All I can say is that I have ridden to-day in three taxicabs whose drivers took the other view.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield the floor.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I think the demand for the meter comes very largely from the two big companies that are trying to control the situation in Washington.

My impression is practically in line with that of the Senator from Idaho and others, that the majority of the taxi drivers here do not want the meter system, and that the two big companies are trying to crowd out the independents.

I received to-day the letter I have in my hand from an independent driver who is very much interested in this matter; and I will say that the overwhelming sentiment, as I get it, is against the meter so far as these independent drivers are concerned. In this letter he says:

The Public Utilities Commission's meter recommendation means about a 40 per cent increase in rates, and a decrease in riders of from 50 to 75 per cent. About 2,000 cabs carry their own insurance. The meters will force from 1,000 to 3,000 men out of work, and the meters will mean more accidents.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a minute? It will help the street-car system; will it not?

Mr. CAPPER. To be sure. The street-car companies, too, are very persistent in their efforts.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPPER. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does the Senator know of a city in the United States where there is better and cheaper taxicab service than has been afforded to the city of Washington during the last 12 months?

Mr. CAPPER. I do not; and I think it has been greatly improved in the last year, and the situation is better than it was under the old system.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is just another effort to subsidize some special interest, that is all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BORAH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may the entire question be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 24, the committee proposes to strike out lines 24 and 25, down to the end of line 6 on page 7, and to insert:

No part of the appropriations contained in this act shall be used for or in connection with the preparation, issuance, publication, or enforcement of any regulation or order of the Public Utilities Commission requiring the installation of meters in taxicabs if the initial rate exceeds 25 cents for the first 2 miles, or portion thereof, and 10 cents a mile thereafter: *Provided*, That this prohibition shall not be construed to affect any order or part of an order of such Public Utilities Commission other than with respect to the requirement of the installation of such meters.

Mr. BLACK. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BLACK. A negative vote will be a vote to strike the meter provision out, will it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; to strike out the Senate committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A negative vote will be a vote to reinsert the House provision.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to let this matter go to a vote until the whole truth, founded on the testimony, has been presented to the Senate.

It is all very well to impute motives of dishonor or other motives to those who take a different view from the views which have been stated here so vigorously this afternoon, but I assure the Senate that there is quite another side to this question, and if it is the desire of the Senate to listen to me, and to take the time, I shall be glad to speak, or wait until to-morrow, as the Senate pleases.

Mr. President, the most extravagant statements have been made here to-day, founded on questions propounded to a few taxicab drivers. A little while ago the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], my leader, asked the question, "Have we not better and cheaper taxicab service in the District of Columbia than anywhere else in the country?" The answer given him was "Yes." I dispute that. We have here probably cheaper taxicab service than in any city of the same size or of larger size in the country, but there is no worse service anywhere than here. There is no service which contributes so much to accidents in the streets. There is no service anywhere which contributes so much to the distress of the drivers.

The committee received evidence to the effect that many of the drivers of taxicabs in this city are being supported by the missions. Men strive here to have the farmer get a proper price for his product, who desire to have the farmer receive for his wheat and corn the cost of production, and, if possible, a little profit, but with the taxicab business, these taxicab drivers can hardly live, even the fortunate ones, and there are hundreds of them who are being cared for in part by charity.

Of course, Senators may reflect, "Well, now, my fare has been 20 cents, but under the meter system it will be 35 cents." If a Senator is willing to have that fact influence his vote, that is his business; it is not mine.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I am thinking about the fellow who owns his taxicab, or is trying to own his taxicab, who tells me that he will be put out of business if this provision goes into effect, and that he now is making a living. A poor living, but still a living. I could bring to the Senator a number of young men who are perfectly willing to go on record to that effect. I do not suppose there are very many Senators who ride home with a man who hauls them for 20 cents who content themselves with paying merely 20 cents. I doubt very much if there are very many, if any, Senators who do that. But I am anxious that the young man who is undertaking to make his living by driving a taxicab be not put out of business, and I am particularly

anxious that the combination which is against him be not successful.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho is usually right on large matters, but I say to him in all kindness that on this small matter he is mistaken.

Mr. BORAH. This is no small matter to the man who has no other way of making a living. The right or chance to earn a living is no small matter.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me say to the Senator that the men before the committee fighting against this were the big taxicab companies of the city.

Mr. BORAH. Let me tell the Senator that the big taxicab fellows are not against it. I have been informed many times that it is the big companies who are arguing the matters. I am sure I can demonstrate that fact if given an opportunity.

Mr. COPELAND. I will be very happy to hear the Senator attempt to demonstrate it, because I sat through the hearings, and I saw the representatives of the big companies come here.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. I know how the big companies present their men to the committees. They do not themselves go, but the big companies are in favor of this proposition. Why should they not be? It means putting out of business the independent men who are making a living.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator speaks as if the rate in this city were 20 cents all over the city. As a matter of fact, we have a zone system here. It so happens that the Senator lives within the one zone.

Mr. BORAH. It so happens that the Senator lives within the limits of the city, and that is the zone.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator thinks that one can go anywhere in this city, under the present system, for 20 cents, there is no man in the Senate more mistaken than the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. I say to the Senator that I go home every night, and my secretary goes home every night, and either go within the limits of the city, and could go, if we had a mind to do so, for 20 cents.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator goes within the first zone of the city. If he had occasion to cross Wisconsin Avenue, he would pay another 20 cents.

Mr. BORAH. Suppose we cross the Million Dollar Bridge, as it is called, and go on the other side of the canyon; is that still in the zone?

Mr. COPELAND. Until you get to a certain point a quarter of a mile beyond the canyon; then you get into another zone.

Mr. BORAH. I feel that I could bring the Senator plenty of testimony to prove that the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. COPELAND. I will be very glad to hear the testimony, because I listened to an abundance of testimony, and I can stand some more, particularly if it justifies the position which the Senator from Idaho takes, which is a mistaken position, and he will find it to be so when he studies the evidence.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. REED. My home is 3 miles from the Capitol, and the taxicab fare at present is 20 cents. I am thoroughly convinced that no operator of a taxicab can make such a trip and even begin to pay expenses, to say nothing of taking care of his own personal needs. Naturally, as the Senator from Idaho has said, no one would dream of asking for such a ride for the bare 20 cents. But I have talked with a great many of these men, and their distress is evident. They are threadbare, and ragged, and pinched, and if a man is trying to support a family on any such scale of wage, it is obviously impossible for him to do more than keep body and soul together. I feel ashamed of myself every time I take such a trip in a cab labeled "20-cent taxi." Yet, there must be many people who would not dream of paying more than the stipulated rate of 20 cents. I am sure every Senator here feels the way I do about it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator must bear in mind that while that is true, any number of rides for 20

cents are for two or three blocks, or half a dozen blocks, and it is by such fares, the men explain to me, they make their living. If all of the trips were these long rides about which the Senator speaks, of course they could not make a living. But a person may get in a taxicab here and drive down two or three blocks, or half a dozen blocks for 20 cents. It is through these short trips that the drivers make their money.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. REED. I talked to a taxicab driver over in front of the Senate Office Building about noon to-day. He told me he had had one fare this morning and his fare gave him no tip. He had to spend the 20 cents to buy 2 gallons of gasoline. He did not have one red copper cent to get himself any lunch. He told it without any complaint as if it were the ordinary day's experience. I do not see how we can contemplate such a situation imperturbably.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The remedy is not in putting in meters. If the existing fare is too low, let us give them a better fare; but when we require them to install meters we legislate for the benefit of the big taxicab company here.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, there are a number of Senators who have expressed their desire that the matter of the taxicab situation go over until to-morrow. I wonder if the Senator from New York may find it convenient to continue his discussion to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock?

Mr. COPELAND. Very well.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the Senator yield to me at this time to move a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before the Senator moves a recess may I say to Senators present that the hearings on the appropriation bill, at page 204, contain the names of those who came before the committee in what I conceive to be opposition to the independent taxicab drivers and, indirectly at least, favoring an increase in taxicab rates. The names are disclosed in the statement of Thomas W. Littlepage on behalf of the citizens' joint transportation committee, he being the chairman of that committee. His statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, this committee is a citizens' joint transportation committee made up with a view of attempting to help work out the traffic and transportation system in the District of Columbia.

The representatives on this committee represent the Washington Board of Trade, the Merchants and Manufacturers Association, the Federation of Churches, the Typothetae, the Federation of Civil Associations, the Cosmopolitan Club, the Zonta Club, the Quota Club, the Kiwanis, the Optimist Club, and the chamber of commerce.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SHORTRIDGE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14724) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "(None of which shall be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by more than eight

nonflying officers or observers, to be selected by the Secretary of the Navy"); and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "but nothing herein shall be construed as preventing the voluntary employment in any such capacity of a retired enlisted man or a transferred member of the Fleet Naval Reserve without additional expense to the Government"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$744,794"; and the Senate agree to the same.

SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE,
FREDERICK HALE,
HENRY W. KEYES,
CARTER GLASS,
E. S. BROUSSARD,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

W. A. AYRES,
W. B. OLIVER,
BURTON L. FRENCH,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I move the adoption of the report. The report was agreed to.

LANDS IN RAPIDES PARISH, LA.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11242) to relinquish the title of the United States in and to lands in Rapides Parish, State of Louisiana. The bill is unanimously reported by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. It is favorably reported on by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and by the Department of the Interior.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to section 57, township 4 north, range 1 west, Louisiana meridian, Rapides Parish, La., containing 135⁴¹/₁₀₀ acres, as shown on a plat of survey made by A. C. Phelps, deputy surveyor, approved March 13, 1839, by H. F. Williams, surveyor general for the district of Louisiana, and segregated thereon as a double concession, be, and the same is hereby, released, relinquished, and confirmed by the United States to J. Taylor Compton, T. Maddox Compton, Ursula Compton Craig, and the legal representatives of J. M. Armstrong, and to their respective heirs and assigns forever: *Provided*, That the said parties shall first submit to the Secretary of the Interior satisfactory evidence of long continuous possession of the said land under claim or color of title, together with payment for the said land at the rate of \$1.25 per acre.

Sec. 2. That when the required evidence and payment have been made a patent shall issue for the said described land to J. Taylor Compton, T. Maddox Compton, Ursula Compton Craig, and the legal representatives of J. M. Armstrong: *Provided*, That such patent shall only amount to a relinquishment of any right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land.

AWARDS OF THE MIXED CLAIMS COMMISSION, ETC.

Mr. GLASS. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12328) to authorize the assignment of awards entered by the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, the Tripartite Claims Commission, and the War Claims Arbitrator. I will state that this bill was unanimously reported by the House committee and unanimously adopted in the House, and it has the unanimous report of the committee of the Senate.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (g) of section 2 of the settlement of war claims act of 1928 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(5) In the case of an assignment of an award, or an assignment (prior to the making of the award) of the claim in respect

of which the award was made, by any such person, made in writing, duly acknowledged, and filed with the application for payment, such payment shall be made to the assignee."

Sec. 2. Subsection (k) of section 3 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(5) In the case of an assignment of an award, or an assignment (prior to the making of the award) of the claim in respect of which the award was made, by any such person, made in writing duly acknowledged, and filed with the application for payment, such payment shall be made to the assignee."

Sec. 3. Subsection (f) of section 5 and subsection (h) of section 6 of such act are hereby amended by striking out "(4)" where it occurs in such subsections and inserting in lieu thereof "(5)."

CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF AMENDMENT TO BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. HASTINGS submitted the following concurrent resolution, which was read, considered, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 14359) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, the Clerk of the House is authorized to make the following necessary changes in the Senate engrossed amendment:

On page 1, line 6, beginning with "by," strike out through the word "and" in line 7.

On page 1, line 14, strike out "74 and 75" and insert in lieu thereof "74, 75, and 77."

On page 19, line 16, strike out "or compositions"; and in lines 21 and 24, strike out the words "or composition."

On page 39, line 12, strike out the figure "76."

On page 41, line 9, beginning with the word "railroad," strike out through the period in line 11.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on to-day, March 1, 1933, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1752. An act to authorize an appropriation for the purchase of land in South Dakota for use as camp sites or rifle ranges for the National Guard of said State;

S. 2654. An act to allow credit in connection with homestead entries to widows of persons who served in certain Indian wars;

S. 4008. An act to amend article 5 of the act of Congress approved June 7, 1897, relating to the approval of regulations for preventing collisions upon certain harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States;

S. 5233. An act to provide for the protection of national military parks, national parks, battlefield sites, national monuments, and miscellaneous memorials under the control of the War Department;

S. 5417. An act to extend the operation of the act entitled "An act for the temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects constructed and operated under the reclamation law," approved April 1, 1932;

S. 5445. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

S. 5469. An act to provide for the creation of the Morristown National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes;

S. 5525. An act to extend temporary relief to water users on irrigation projects on Indian reservations, and for other purposes;

S. 5622. An act providing for an alternate budget for the Indian Service, fiscal year 1935;

S. 5675. An act to effect needed changes in the Navy ration; and

S. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to remove existing discriminations incident to certain land grants and to subject them to the same conditions that govern other land grants of their class," approved February 14, 1933.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14199) making appropriations

for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 11, 32, 33, and 40 to the said bill, and concurred therein; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 5, 9, 16, and 18, and had concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 6, 7, 8, 12, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, 36, 37, and 41; that the House requested a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. COLLINS, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. PARKS, Mr. BARBOUR, and Mr. CLAGUE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 10 to the bill (H. R. 14458) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, and concurred therein; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 11 to the said bill; that the House agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOODRUM, Mr. BOYLAN, and Mr. SUMMERS of Washington were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask that the action of the House of Representatives on the War Department appropriation bill may be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives, which was read in part, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, March 1, 1933.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 11, 32, 33, and 40 to the bill (H. R. 14199) entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 5 and concur therein with the following amendment:

Page 8 of the engrossed bill, lines 21, 22, and 23, strike out "which shall draw interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and such fund, including interest accruals" and insert "and such fund."

Mr. REED. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate to me, before any of these motions are put, at what point the so-called Couzens amendment will arise for consideration in respect to the handling of boys in cantonments?

Mr. REED. I am going to ask that that matter go to conference. I will ask for the appointment of conferees on those items on which the House persists in disagreeing. That will be one of the items which will go to the new conference.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, there is nothing in the program of the Senate now which contemplates the foreclosure of further action on that amendment?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5.

The motion was agreed to.

The legislative clerk read from the House action, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9, and concur therein with the following amendment:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "conviction has been affirmed by an appellate court unless approved by the Secretary of War."

Mr. REED. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 9.

The motion was agreed to.

The legislative clerk read from the House action, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16, and concur therein with the following amendment: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended by inserting in lieu of the amount named therein "\$2,700,000."

Mr. REED. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 16.

The motion was agreed to.

The legislative clerk read from the House action, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 18, and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "\$11,383,865."

Mr. REED. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18.

The motion was agreed to.

The legislative clerk read from the House action, as follows:

That the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 8, 12, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, 36, 37, and 41.

The House asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and appoints Mr. COLLINS, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. PARKS, Mr. BARBOUR, and Mr. CLAGUE to be the managers on the part of the House at said conference.

Mr. REED. On those amendments, just stated, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REED, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. STEIWER, Mr. CUTTING, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. McKELLAR, and Mr. FLETCHER conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

RECESS

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, March 2, 1933, at 10 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1933

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of our fathers, Thy sovereign mercy and Thy daily providences are the overarching and the undergirding realities of our fondest hopes. It is through care divine that we are still treading our accustomed pathways; we thank Thee; how great are our obligations. O fill our breasts with the mightiest meanings until the laws of truth and charity become native in the depths of our souls. Forgive our trespasses; bury them in the sea of forgetfulness and remember them against us no more forever. May our labors be as fruitful vines, whose leaves shall be for the healing of the wounds of our Nation. In all of our relations to our high calling may we follow the teachings of the Man of Galilee. In His name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of